THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXIX.—OCTOBER, 1904—No. 116.

THE POWER OF THE KEYS IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

A.

"The members of the Conference are agreed that the discipline of Private Confession and Absolution cannot be shown to have existed for some centuries after the foundation of the Church. It grew, in fact, out of the gradual disuse, perhaps about the fifth century, of . . . Public Penance." —Report of the Fulham Round Table Conference on Confession and Absolution, p. 109.)

B.

"That the Primitive Church knew nothing of this [the Power of the Keys] is plainly inferable from the silence of the Early Fathers."—(Mr. Lea, "The Power of the Keys," p. 109.)

C.

"This power [of the Keys] is not permitted to heresy, for this right is granted to priests alone. Rightly, then, does the Church that has real priests claim this power. Heresy that has not priests of God cannot claim it."—(St. Ambrose, "De Pœnitentia," lib. i., c. 2.)

THERE are two kinds of Christian Apologetics, one general, the other special. The one deals mainly with the Divinity of Christ and the credentials of the Church, the other with the details of the Christian Faith. Moreover, the latter employs different methods for different classes of truths. Mysteries, for example—the Trinity, say, and the Incarnation—involve, chiefly, questions of philosophy; the Sacraments, questions of history. It is the latter method—the historical—with which we are in this paper mostly concerned. Furthermore, the historical method used by opponents against the Sacraments, and especially against the Sacra-

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1903, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

ment of Penance, is not positive but negative. They urge not precisely that historical evidence is against the Sacrament of Penance, but rather that there is not enough historical evidence for it.

I.

THE METHOD OF PROOF.

How is this manner of argumentation to be met? Are we to reply by the production of Biblical texts? Is the Holy Bible to be in this matter the final court of appeal? Is Scripture to be recognized as the only storehouse of revealed truth? Restricting our consideration to the Sacraments, and specifically to the Sacrament of Penance, we freely admit that the Bible is on this matter exceedingly brief. Who, then, is to be here the authoritative interpreter of the Bible?

On this question, as on others, Protestants[1] are driven to appeal to a source external to the Bible. They are obliged to consult Tradition. I take three instances—one negative and two positive. First, Anglicans must fall back on Tradition to show that feet-washing is not a sacrament, in face of Christ's words: "If, then, I your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you." (St. John xiii., 13.) Secondly, only by Tradition can they prove that the baptism of infants is a sacrament. Christ said: "Except a *man* be born of water," etc. (St. John iii., 5.) Thirdly, only by Tradition can they prove that baptism conferred by heretics is valid. For a long time the invalidity was hotly maintained on many hands until Pope Siricius towards the end of the fourth century scotched the error by a dogmatic decree. In these three instances the Bible by itself affords no solid basis; nay, it rather suggests difficulties. Yet these are revelations of Christ. For Christ alone could institute Sacraments, and He alone could lay down the conditions under which the sacramental rites should be valid or invalid.

But more fundamental still for the Protestant, the New Testament on which he, most illogically, ultimately bases Christianity cannot be proved to be inspired, except by means of the organon of Tradition. Christ Himself never declared the New Testament inspired, for He wrote none of it, and no part of it existed during His lifetime. No Book of the New Testament declares itself inspired. Nor even if it did would its word avail anything, since the testimony is worthless of a witness to his own veracity. But

[1] By "Protestant," I understand one who being baptized does not admit the infallible authority of the Pope.

from among the many documents inspired and apocryphal,[2] the Church, the mouthpiece of Tradition, at the end of the fourth century, picked out those we now call "canonical," and declared them, and them alone, to be inspired. Therefore our certainty of inspiration is conditioned by our prior certainty of the infallibility of the Church, the mouthpiece of Tradition.

Here, then, as Protestants admit, we have essential questions of revelation, and yet of a revelation that has not been clearly handed down by the Bible. By whom, therefore? The answer by Catholics and Protestants is identical. By Tradition!

The Sacrament of Penance is then, we are agreed, to be found not in Scripture alone, but in Scripture and Tradition.

But what do we mean, precisely, by Tradition? Is Tradition nothing more than the ecclesiastical literature of past centuries? Nothing else than historical documents? Has it all been written down and preserved by the Fathers? Certainly not. Turn to the Sacraments and you find at once that the deficiencies of the Bible reappear, to some extent, in the Fathers. Where do they enumerate the Seven Sacraments? Where do they set forth the essential forms of the Sacraments? What reason have we to assume that the Fathers wrote down all the Tradition with which they were familiar? The Patristic tomes are not catechisms, not handbooks, not systematic treatises on Dogmatics, not formal manuals of Moral Theology. The writings of the Fathers were penned—like the Books of the New Testament—to meet special occasions, to supply particular wants, in answer to specific questions, to suit local circumstances. Moreover, we know that the *disciplina arcani* was scrupulously observed in regard to the Sacraments—"mysteries" as they were called—and therefore that the Church trusted largely to oral transmission. Furthermore, through the invasions of barbarians, the persecutions of heretics and the hostility of pagans, many writings of the Fathers have utterly perished.

Consequently we have a right to be suspicious of the negative contention that Penance is not a Sacrament because the rite is not clearly set forth in either the Bible or the early Fathers; that its appearance in later ecclesiastical literature counts for nothing since it is found in no texts of the earlier centuries, before primitive Christianity had had time to grow corrupt. Opponents do indeed offer these unsatisfactory arguments and arbitrarily fix the beginnings of this imaginary "corruption," some at one date, some at another, to suit the varying exigencies of this or that controversy.

---

[2] For example, the Epistle of St. Clement was in the early days read publicly in many churches, and in some Codices is ranked among the inspired writings.

Moreover, the *à priori* argument is obvious enough, that as the post-Apostolic ages are never to be granted a new revelation, God must have given to these ages, as a final Judge of appeal, something more than a fragmentary Bible, supplemented by informal, lost or mutilated ecclesiastical writings. If there is to be no salvation without faith,[3] and no faith without belief in the whole of God's revelation,[4] and no real belief in that revelation without certainty,[5] surely there is, at any rate, a presumption in favor of that living and continuous infallibility which is the mark of world-wide Catholic beliefs, of the Church's universal practice concerning the Sacraments, and of her solemn decisions in controverted questions.

No one who admits a visible Church would on *à priori* grounds deny its infallibility as impossible or absurd. Nor will any reasonable person deny that certain Scriptural expressions at any rate favor this infallibility. Christ said, in effect: "Go, teach, baptize, and behold I am with you always, everywhere to the end." "I will send you the Spirit of Truth to dwell forever with you." And St. Paul: "The Church is without spot or blemish, the pillar and ground of the truth."

Nor will any competent scholar deny that from very early times the Fathers seem, at least, to teach infallibility; for instance, when Irenæus bears witness to the "charisma of certain truth belonging to the Succession of the Episcopate."[6]

Tradition, therefore, implies more than written history. It extends beyond manuscripts. It is more extensive than texts. It is not exhausted by the sifting of printed evidence. The Church is the organ of Tradition, the Church infallible, assisted supernaturally, mystically, divinely. The Church is the living storehouse of Tradition, and even if printed books fail, still she may be implicitly trusted. For the Church has been present as a witness of the facts whereto she testifies, she has an unfailing memory, and she never dies.

It will be said, perhaps, that this doctrine does not commend itself to the modern spirit. From Anglicans, however, such an objection comes with an illgrace. They admit inspiration; with what consistency, then, can they deny infallibility? For the latter is less of a difficulty than the former. Yet the inspiration of the Bible they recognize. If not, how does the Bible differ from other books? And if it does not differ, why do Protestants pay it such honor, scatter it broadcast, describe it as the storehouse of all revelation? Than inspiration what can there be more supernatural,

[3] "Without faith it is impossible to please God." (Heb. xi. 6.)

[4] "Going teach all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (St. Matt. xxviii. 20.)

[5] Faith is to believe without doubting all that God has revealed.

[6] Irenæus, "Contra Hæreses," iv., c. 26; Migne, vii., col. 1053.

more mystical, more divine? Infallibility is a smaller gift than inspiration. For inspiration is a positive charisma, infallibility only a negative; inspiration teaches what should be said; infallibility only withholds from teaching what should not be said. Moreover, infallibility is a gift absolutely necessary to safeguard inspiration, to shelter it from false and contradictory interpretations. Without infallibility, inspiration is in practice all but useless—as the continued multiplication of religious sects daily proves, and the contradictory interpretation of Bible texts makes obvious. Protestants may not, then, deny infallibility because it is supernatural and mystical, yet admit inspiration, which is still more supernatural and still more mystical.

The Fathers themselves refer us to unwritten Tradition. They consider as infallibly certain the universal custom and practice of the Church, even where there are no ancient documents to which to appeal. Take three brief instances:

First. Against the Pelagians St. Augustine argues, from the general practice in his day, to the validity of infant baptism. Infant baptism was, and is, a universal custom, not proved by written documents, but based solely on the authority of the Church our Mother, the assured rule of truth, the impregnable wall from which every attack falls back baffled.[7]

Secondly. Fulgentius has to solve the question whether or not the baptism was valid of an adult, who having asked for it, and then become unconscious, had been baptized in that state. In the Bible there was nothing to which to appeal, nothing in earlier writers. But Fulgentius appealed confidently to Church usage—which was, in such a case, to baptize—and said that "the Church would not thus act if thereby this man received nothing. For the Apostle bears witness that the Church is 'the pillar and the ground of truth.' Were there an instance in the mysteries of the faith wherein the Church was not infallible, the Church would no longer be 'the pillar and ground of the truth.' "[8]

Thirdly. As in the West, so too in the East. St. Basil wrote: "The Apostles and Fathers who, at the beginning, prescribed certain rites for the Church, safeguard by silence and secrecy the dignity of the holy mysteries. A mystery is no longer a mystery if it be published abroad and made notorious. Consequently, in the transmission of certain matters they avoided the expression of them in writing." St. Basil there applies the *disciplina arcani* to the "mysteries," that is, the Sacraments.[9]

---

[7] St. Augustine, "Serm." 294, cc. 17, 18; Migne, xxxviii. col. 1346.
[8] Fulgentius, "Epist." 12, c. 10; Migne, lxv. col. 389.
[9] St. Basil, "De Spirit. Sanct." c. 32; Migne, "P. G." xxxii. col. 187.

The Fathers therefore recognize as notorious the existence of oral Tradition.

To the objection that oral Tradition must needs be distorted by time, we have a two-fold answer. First, not if the Tradition concern a plain detail of routine practice, such as is the simple administration of a Sacrament. Secondly, not if God be watching over this oral Tradition and safeguarding what is essential in the sacred rite.

Against the negative historical attack on religion, and especially on the Sacraments, and specifically on the Sacrament of Penance, we have a two-fold method of defense—the analytic and the synthetic. Each detail of the faith which the heretic attacks, the analytic method would defend by confronting the negation with an array of historical texts; the synthetic, by setting forth essential teaching and practice of the infallible Church. The former method is long and unsatisfactory; the latter short and efficacious. Life is too brief to be ever prying among the foundations of our spiritual house to see whether they can support the superstructure which in fact shelters us. That truth was, eighteen centuries ago, realized and well expressed by Tertullian:

> It is a thankless job to engage in a quest wherein your discovery must beget weariness and vexation. . . . You may perchance lose only your voice and waste merely the efforts of your lungs, but neither will you gain anything, except perhaps bile and the hearing of blasphemies.[10]

Hence he suggests a better plan:

> Before plunging into a discussion of the Scriptures, our business is to ask, first to whom the Scriptures belong, from whom the faith comes, by whom and to whom the Gospel doctrine has been transmitted? All questions under dispute are thus focussed into one. For from the moment we know where Christ's doctrine really exists, we are certain to find there the true Scriptures, the true interpretation of them, and the true Christian tradition.[11]

"The true Christian Tradition!" Therefore not only does the Church, the guardian of all revealed truth, unerringly preserve the Bible and the true meaning of the Bible, she is also the unfailing custodian of ancient Tradition and the only trustworthy interpreter of the contents of that Tradition.

But, it will be said, "Patristic documents are stubborn facts. Are you then afraid of facts?" We reply by asking what is here meant precisely by "facts?" These "facts" are positive or negative. If we are dealing with Penance, they either prove—negatively—that nothing was said about Penance, or—positively—that things were said adverse to Penance. These "facts" are either the fact of silence or the fact of adverse statement. The positive argument may be satisfactory, the negative argument is nearly always insufficient.

[10] Tertull, "De Præscrip." c. 15; Migne, ii. col. 28.

[11] Id. ib. c. 19.

The positive argument tries, let us say, to show, by patristic quotations, an absolute and essential contradiction between the primitive and the later Church. Take the instance of baptism touched on above. The primitive Church baptized by immersion, the later Church suppressed immersion. Here is an obvious contradiction. Is it also essential? The "fact" is beyond dispute. Are we then "afraid of the fact?" Not in the least. For though an obvious fact, it is not an essential fact. The change in question affects only accidentals. Baptism performed by sprinkling water on the head of the child is *essentially* the same as the baptism of adults by immersion. But why is immersion not essential? Because the Church says it is not. Well, but how does the Church know? By unwritten Tradition. It is, therefore, not enough to have "facts," but we need an authoritative interpretation of the "facts."

The negative argument from the "facts," which we are supposed to fear, is even less satisfactory. It amounts to this: To prove such and such a point—say, early Auricular Confession—you Catholics have no documents, or not enough documents or documents not ancient enough, or documents not decisive enough. Such an argument, however, is rarely valid, and is never safe. For silence is not equivalent to disproof. One witness who affirms excels a thousand who say nothing. The testimony of Catholic Tradition, even when unwritten, affords a basis of belief which the negative argument from silence does nothing to destroy. Before the negative argument can acquire any validity these three following canons of criticism must be duly established:

First Canon. It must be proved that had the point in dispute been a fact, the author whose silence is invoked could not have remained ignorant of that fact.

Second Canon. That, unless ignorant, he could not, for any reason, have remained silent about it.

Third Canon. That in all his works, preserved or lost, he did remain silent about it.

In the matter of early Auricular Confession, an adversary must show that no known early author even once refers to it in any work of his which we possess, or in any which may have been lost; that had he known of it he could not have rested satisfied with oral Tradition, but must of necessity have put it down in writing in the days when writing was much more uncommon than now; that there was no *disciplina arcani*, or any other reason to prevent its being written down.

And in applying these canons to early Auricular Confession these following facts are to be borne in mind:

Confession was far less *en évidence* then than it is now. In those

early ages there was no custom of confessing venial sins. There was no law of annual confession, so that those who thought themselves sinless did not approach the tribunal of Penance. Moreover, the evil custom crept in of communicating without first confessing, as we know from the complaints of St. John Chrysostom.[12] Many remained catechumens all their lives—for example, Constantine and Constantius—and were satisfied to be baptized when *in extremis*, and therefore it is probable that many of those who had been baptized and had fallen into sin deferred till the last their reconciliation with God by confession. As to the silence of the ancient ecclesiastical Canons, they treated of external details. Public Penance, for instance, and as a rule said little or nothing about the inner part of the Sacraments, or about what took place in private. And as to the silence of liturgical works, it must be remembered that Auricular Confession was not a sacrament distinct from Public Penance, any more than Private Baptism is a sacrament distinct from Solemn Baptism; in each case they are but different forms of the same. And as oral Tradition and custom sufficed to hand down the simple form of Baptism, so have they also sufficed to hand down the simple form of Penance—Auricular Confession.[13]

II.

THE RATIO THEOLOGICA.

Having thus briefly discussed the method of proof, let us now shortly apply that method to the question in hand, the existence of private and sacramental Confession in the early ages of Christianity. We argue to that existence by the following summary of theological reasoning.

The Council of Trent defined the Sacrament of Penance to have been instituted *jure divino*, and to be necessary to salvation.[14] It defined, moreover, that private confession to a priest in secret, which had been ever practised in the Church *from the beginning*, was not foreign to Christ's institution and command, and was not a human invention.[15] Moreover, the Council defined confession to be necessary in this sense, that all mortal sins committed after baptism had to be confessed, and not merely that the penitent had to submit his conscience to the keys once in life, after which he should be left to his

---

[12] "Hom. de Bapt. Christi." n. 4; Migne, xlix. col. 369.

referred to? Nevertheless they believe in it and teach it.

[14] "Si quis negaverit Confessionem Sacramentalem vel institutam vel ad

[13] In the sermons of present-day preachers how often is Extreme Unction

salutem necessariam esse jure divino . . . A. S." (Sess. 14, can. 6; Denzinger's "Enchiridion," n. 794.)

[15] Id. ib.

own private contrition.[16] And this necessity for integral and repeated confession the Council deduced from the very words whereby Christ instituted the Sacrament of Penance.[17] Furthermore, the Council emphatically and repeatedly declares that the Church has *always* held this doctrine.[18]

Moreover, in the Constitution "Auctorem Fidei," in which Pius VI. (August 28, 1794) stigmatized eighty-five propositions of the Synod of Pistoia, he condemns the Jansenists who, relying on what they called the venerable discipline of ancient days, proposed as an excellent deterrent from sin to refuse absolution to relapsed sinners even at the hour of death. This hideous proposal the Pope declared to be contrary to the thirteenth canon of the First Council of Nice, to the decretal of Innocent I. to Exsuperius, to the decretal of Celestine I. to the Bishops of the Province of Vienne and Narbonne, and to be redolent of that wrong-headedness which Celestine rejected with horror.[19]

The fifteen members of the Fulham Round Table Conference had the courage to say, in effect, that they were unable to agree with the opinions and decisions of the Tridentine Fathers! But if the Church at any period of her existence had reduced the Saacrament of Penance to the narrow limits of Public Penance, according to the Council of Trent she would have violated divine law. For Public Penance was confined to certain mortal sins, the sacrament extends to all. Public Penance was not given twice; the sacrament must be given as often as the relapsed sinner asks for it with contrition. Public Penance could not be given to a dying sinner; the Sacrament of Penance could, and was so given.

Therefore, besides Public Penance there was also another less manifest form of Sacramental Penance—Auricular Confession.

For the sake of brevity and clearness we now proceed to lay down the following positions, the right understanding of which will tend

[16] "Si quis dixerit in Catholica Ecclesia Pœnitentiam non esse vere et proprie Sacramentum, pro fidelibus, quoties post Baptismum in peccata labuntar, ipsi Deo reconciliandis, a Christo institutum A. S." (Id. 16, can. 1; Denzinger, n. 789.) And again, "Esse jure divino confiteri omnia et singula peccata mortalia." (Can. 7; Denzinger, n. 795.)

[17] Cap. 5; Denz. n. 779; St. Matt. ix. 6; St. Mark ii. 10: "The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins." St. John xx. 21: "As My Father hath sent Me, even so I send you." St. John xx. 22: "He breathed on them and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted; and whosesoever sins ye retain they are retained." (Cf. St. Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18.) This was well put by Lord Halifax at the Round Table Conference. (Cf. p. 12, Report.)

[18] "Universorum Patrum consensus semper intellexit." (Sess. 14, cap. 1; Denz. n. 774.) "Universa Ecclesia semper intellexit." (Cap. 5; Denz. n. 779.) "Secreta Confessio sacramentalis qua ab initio Ecclesia usa est." (Cap. 5, Denz. n. 780; Can. 3, Denz. n. 791; Can. 6, Denz. n. 794.)

[19] Denzinger, n. 1401.

greatly to simplify the complicated question under discussion. The concatenation of these headings we leave in part to the acumen of the reader.

III.

WHAT WAS THE MATTER OF PUBLIC PENANCE?

Public Penance, Tertullian,[20] an eye-witness, describes as the discipline of prostration and humiliation. He describes the penitents as clothed in sackcloth and ashes, with unwashed bodies; their food bread and water. They had to fast and pray, to grovel at the feet of others, to groan and lament with tears. They lay at the church door, not being allowed admittance, sometimes for years and sometimes for life. Public Penance, however, varied very considerably in different parts of the Church.

But this stern punishment was limited to the three Penitential or Capital sins of Idolatry, Homicide and Adultery, understood, however, in a generic sense. These were *the* mortal sins, *par excellence*. Idolatry was the lapse of a Christian back into paganism. Homicide included brigandage. Adultery stood for the grosser sins of uncleanness.

Be it then carefully noted that the sins for which Public Penance was done were three, and three only.

Other sins must therefore have been forgiven in another way—by Private Confession.

The Penitential sins were three. Tertullian[21] (born 160) writes:

> Behold the Idolater, the Homicide, and (between them) the Adulterer. All three seated together, through the duty of penance, grimy in sackcloth and ashes, breathing the same sighs, soliciting by the same prayers the compassion of the faithful, casting themselves in the same fashion on their knees, and invoking the same Mother.

And St. Gregory of Nyssa (born 330) explains why these Penitential sins were three only. Moreover, we may note that he is describing a state of things long prior to his own, the fourth century, for he makes constant appeal to the institutions and traditions of the Fathers. In his Canonical Epistle to Letojus, Bishop of Melitines,[22] he divides sins into three classes, according to the Greek tripartite division of the soul faculties, into the Rational, Concupiscible and Irascible,[23] and in each of these classes the spiritual physicians have chosen one, and one only, for cure by canonical penance. To the Rational part belongs idolatry, that is, the apostasy from Christian-

---

[20] "De Pœnit," c. 9; Hurter's "Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula," vol. v. p. 196.

[21] "De Pudicitia," c. 5; Migne, ii. 987.

[22] Migne, xlv. 222.

[23] τὸ λογιστικόν, τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν, τὸ Θυμοειδές.

ity to paganism, the penance for which is lifelong. To the Concupiscible part belongs adultery, *i. e.*, uncleanness; for which the penance is three years' exclusion from public prayer, three more years among the "auditors," and a third three among the "prostrated." To the Irascible part belongs homicide, which includes brigandage, sacrilege, the theft of consecrated objects and the violation of sepulchres.

There were many other mortal sins besides those which were called Penitential or Canonical, as St. Gregory in this self-same passage (canon v.) clearly testifies. He says:

> From anger flow, without doubt, many sins and evils of all kinds. However, our ancestors judged it well not to censure them all, not to display overmuch zeal in the attempt to cure all the sins begotten of anger . . . Hence against homicide alone have they set up the barrier of Public Penance.

It is of prime importance to grasp this fact, that there were other mortal sins besides the three that fell under the Canonical Penance. How, then, were they forgiven? By Auricular Confession. Take heresy, for instance. It was an enormous sin, and was so regarded. Yet it did not fall under the Canonical Penance. It was forgiven by private sacramental confession. Tertullian writes:

> Who doubts that a heretic, deceived by false teaching, after making known his fall and expiating it by penance, not only obtains pardon, but returns to the bosom of the Church?

Perhaps, however, an adversary might maintain that the early Fathers regarded all sins, except the three Canonical, as venial—even heresy itself? If so, the following passage from St. John Climacus will remove his mistake:

> One day a scholar asked me this hard question: Which is the gravest of all sins after homicide and apostasy? I replied that it was heresy. Then, he said, how comes it that the Catholic Church receives back heretics when they sincerely recant their heresy, and admits them to the mysteries [sacraments]? Whereas the adulterer, in spite of his confession, in spite of the avowal of his sin, is only received back to be kept for a long time from the holy mysteries? [24]

The Penitential or Canonical sins were then three only. The corollary is thus obvious. There was a multitude of mortal sins that did not fall under the Public Penance. Nor could it have been otherwise. For had all those who had sinned mortally been obliged to undergo the Canonical Penance and for years to remain outside the church doors, the church porches would have been full, the churches themselves empty. Yet we know that this was not so. Not indeed because of the absence of mortal sins, for human nature was then very much what it is now, and indeed the Fathers fre-

[24] "Scala Paradisi," grad. 15; Migne, lxxxviii. col. 889.

quently complain bitterly of the moral disorders of their time. St. Paul says: "Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners shall inherit the kingdom of God." (I. Cor. vi., 9.) Among these sins most were non-canonical. Yet they were mortal, excluding from "the kingdom of God." How, then, were they forgiven? By Auricular Confession.

IV.

WERE ALL PENITENTS WHO HAD COMMITTED ANY OF THE THREE CANONICAL CRIMES OBLIGED TO UNDERGO PUBLIC PENANCE?

Not all. Clerics were certainly not. Pope Siricius (canon 585) in his letter to Himerius,[25] lays it down expressly that to no cleric is Public Penance allowed—*pœnitentiam agere cuiquam non conceditur clericorum.* Nor was this an innovation made by Siricius. St. Leo,[26] writing to Rusticus of Narbonne, declares that it "comes down from Apostolic Tradition."

Moreover, to several classes of society Public Penance was an impossibility—to magistrates, to laborers, to all whose toilsome work demanded their whole strength and time, to the sick, to the infirm, to the young, and so forth.

How, then, were their sins forgiven? By Private Confession.

V.

HOW OFTEN WAS THE PUBLIC PENANCE GIVEN?

When a penitent had finished his Public Penance, and then lapsed again into one of the three Canonical crimes, what happened to him? Had he to begin another Public Penance? And, if not, how was the sin forgiven?

The answer is plain. It is abundantly evident that the Public Penance was never repeated. That was the Canonical law.

St. Augustine[27] writes of those who had apostatized and then repented—the famous *lapsi:*

> No place in the church is any longer granted them for this most humiliating penance. Wise and prudent is the decision arrived at that once only in life should a penitent be allowed to undergo it.

What, then, happened when a *lapsus* grew penitent and sought to be reconciled to the Church and to God? Was there no absolu-

[25] Cap. 14, n. 18; Migne, xiii. col. 1145; Hurter's "Opuscula," ton. xvii, p. 217.
[26] Letter 167; Migne, liv. col. 1203; Hurter, "Opuscula," x. p. 64, note.
[27] "Epist." 153, n. 7, ad Macedonium; Migne, xxxiii. 656.

tion from the Church for him? Are we to believe that he was in a far worse plight than a sinner with a Papal reserved case? For the latter could be absolved at any time by the Pope, and by any priest at the hour of the penitent's death.

Before a discipline so barbarous can be fastened upon the Christian Church, it must be demonstrated by arguments clear and cogent as the theorems of geometry.

The assertion of such rigorism is dead against the Council of Trent. In sess, 14, cap. 7,[28] the Council declares that:

> The practice of the Church has at all times (semper) prevailed that there should be no reservation at the hour of death; and therefore that (then) any priest can absolve any class of penitents from any kind of sins and censures.

VI.

WAS PUBLIC PENANCE FOR THE THREE CANONICAL CRIMES OBLIGATORY OR OPTIONAL?

For one class only was it obligatory, for all others optional. It was obligatory for those who had sinned publicly and to the open scandal of the community. They had to undergo it under pain of excommunication. Even when absolved during sickness, they were required to promise to undergo it in case of recovery. But this once only, and never twice.

On the whole, then, Public Penance was not an infliction, but a grace; not a punishment imposed, but a favor granted, and granted but once lest its value should be depreciated. And thus we find that it was only allowed after earnest petition, as Morinus has amply proved.[29] Hence it was regarded as a terrible privation for those who, having relapsed into one of the three capital crimes, were not admitted a second time to Public Penance, because they were adjudged unworthy of such a favor.

In the case of those, therefore, who were not obliged and did not choose to undergo Public Penance, how was this burden of sin remitted? Will any one maintain that there were no means for its remission? It seems clear that such penitents must have had recourse to Private Confession.

VII.

WAS PUBLIC PENANCE IDENTICAL WITH PUBLIC CONFESSION?

No, the former in no sense supposed the latter. The two are, indeed, to be sharply distinguished. No text of the Fathers requires

[28] Denzinger, n. 782.

[29] "Comment. Historico-Dogm. de Pœnitentia," iv. c. 16; v. c. 30.

Public Confession of specific sins. St. Leo (became Pope in 440) lays it down as an apostolic rule that Private Confession is enough even when the Penance is public. The abuse had, no doubt, been introduced by certain rigorists into two or three provinces of Italy, of requiring the faithful who came to be absolved to make a list of their sins to be read out in public. Against this tyranny the Pope protested energetically; he called it "presumption," "unlawful usurpation," "an abuse to be at all costs rooted out;" he laid it down as an absolute and universal principle that it was enough if the guilty conscience was, by secret confession, laid open to a priest in secret.

Public Penance, then, was the "Satisfaction," but it was enough according to Apostolic tradition to make the "Confession" in private. A public avowal of sins, even if, in cases of grave scandal, sometimes counseled, was never imposed as an obligation. We argue, therefore, that Auricular Confession preceded even the Public Penance.

Moreover, if we look to the question of the *sigillum*, the Secret of Confession, it is hard to see how the practice could have been otherwise. For how else could the Seal of Confession have been kept inviolate? Before the penitent undertook a Public Confession, before he ran the grave risk of giving scandal rather than edification by an open declaration of his sins, he had, as Origen observes,[30] first to take counsel either with the Bishop or with the Priest Penitentiary, and to lay open his conscience to them. Without a prior confession, made in private, how could a penitent whose ill-deeds had been entirely secret have had the proper amount of Public Penance assigned him, its place, its degree, its duration, and so on? And having made his confession in private, what would have become of the Seal of Confession if he had been compelled to repeat it in public?

Look at it another way. If Public Confession was a duty, was that duty of divine or human law? If of divine, why is not Public Confession exacted to-day, since divine right cannot change? By the Council of Trent it is expressly declared that the Church has *at all times* held integral confession of all mortal sins to be necessary *jure divino*,[31] but Public Confession to be neither necessary nor *de jure divino*,[32] Public Confession then was not a divine law.

---

[30] Hom. ii. n. 6, In Ps. 37; Migne, xii. col. 1386.

[31] "Universa Ecclesia semper intellexit . . . integram peccatorum Confessionem . . . post Baptismum . . . jure divino necessariam existere." (Sess. 14, cap. 5; Denzinger, n. 779.)

[32] "Etsi Christus non vetuerit quin aliquis . . . delicta sua publice confiteri possit, non est tamen hoc divino præcepto mandatum." (Id. ib.; Denzinger, n. 780.)

But was it a human law? It was sometimes counseled, but was it ever imposed? The Council declares that the imposition—which is not the same thing as the permission—by ecclesiastical law would have been imprudent.[33] Will any one dishonor the Church by imputing to her this "imprudence?" *Nemo malus donec probetur!*

That Public Confession was never obligatory let us support by two citations, one from the Greek, the other from the Latin Church.

Representing the Greeks, St. Basil (born 329) wrote:[34]

> Just as a man does not imprudently make known his bodily ailments to any chance person, but only to those who know how to cure them; in like manner, the confession of sins should be made to those who can cure them.

Who are they? St. Basil answers:[35]

> The dispensers of the Sacred "Mysteries," i. e., Confessors.

In behalf of the Latins we may quote from the "Life of St. Ambrose" (born 340) by his notary, Paulinus:[36]

> When any one had confessed his sins in order to receive penance, the Saint so wept that he forced the penitent to weep also. The crimes that had been confessed to him he spoke of to God alone, making intercession for the guilty one. Thus he left to priests a beautiful example to become intercessors before God rather than accusers before men.

It is obvious that in the fourth century Public Confession was not an obligation.

VIII.

WAS PUBLIC PENANCE A SACRAMENTAL RITE?

It was. It was the "Satisfaction" of private Sacramental Confession. To a penitent who had privately confessed, but had solicited a Public Penance, a true sacramental absolution was given when the Public Penance began. This absolution may have been similar in form, but was entirely distinct in effect from the final reconciliation. This reconciliation was the concluding rite of the Public Penance, was far more solemn in form and therefore was far better known than the initial sacramental absolution. The final reconciliation was sometimes given by a deacon, and though not sacramental absolution, it was nevertheless an absolution from all ecclesiastical censures.

That the sacramental absolution preceded the Public Penance, in the Greek Church at least, is notorious. Morinus[37] proves it

---

[33] "Non satis consulte humana aliqua lege præciperetur ut delicta, præsertim secreta, publica essent confessione aperienda." (Id. ib.)

[34] "Reg. Brev." 229; Migne, xxxi. col. 1235.

[35] Migne, ib. col. 1283.

[36] N. 39; Migne, xiv. col. 40.

[37] Lib. vi. ch. 24.

by the ancient Greek Penitentiaries which he published. Moreover, Sozomen[38] shows that it was the Priest Penitentiary who gave sacramental absolution to penitents before they began the Public Penance.

As to the Latin Church, had its practice in this respect been separated from that of the Greek by such a gulf of difference as opponents pretend, would not clear evidence of the fact have come down to us? Had the Latin Church shown itself so rigorous as to refuse for years absolution to repentant sinners, should we not have heard of it, would there not have been protests, complaints, controversies on the subject? And where is there a trace of any such?

If we turn now from this negative to positive evidence, we may quote St. Augustine, who blamed his priests for deserting their posts in the days of persecution when of their flock some were asking for baptism, others for reconciliation, others for the imposition of penance, all for the consolation and administration of the Sacraments. And he continues:[39]

> If through want of ministers of the Sacraments these hapless ones pass out of life unregenerated (by baptism), or without being loosed (from sin by absolution), what ruin, what loss to their souls?

But what does his distinction between "reconciliation" and the "imposition (or "action" as he calls it) of penance" indicate, if not that sacramental absolution preceded the penance? In such an hour of storm and stress it could not have been the Public Penance they had in mind, but the sacramental absolution that accompanied the imposition of penance.

A little later (in 432) Pope Celestine I., addressing the Bishop of the provinces of Vienne and Narbonne, blames priests and Bishops who refuse "penance" to the dying. Such clerics he calls "soul-murderers."

> What else is this but to add death to the dying and to kill the soul by a cruelty which withholds absolution . . . He therefore deprives a soul of salvation who refuses at the time of death the request for penance.[40]

Of what penance is the Pope here speaking? Certainly not of the Public Penance which lasted for months and even for years. The penitent was dying; the "penance" then could not be that formal "reconciliation" which at the conclusion of Public Penance was, in presence of all the faithful, solemnly given by the Bishop. Celestine is referring neither to the Public Penance nor the Solemn Reconciliation, but to some other form of absolution—that of sacramental Auricular Confession.

---

[38] "Hist. Eccles." vii. ch. 16; Migne, lxvii. col. 1457.

[39] Letter to Honoratus, 228, n. 8; Migne, xxxiii. col. 1016.

[40] Migne, lvi. col. 576.

And, to cite one more instance, Rusticus, Bishop of Narbonne, writes to ask St. Leo (440) what is to be done with those who as children had been baptized, then taken captive by pagans, and who finally returned and asked to be admitted to the sacraments. The Pope answered:

> If they have adored idols, or have committed homicide, or have been fornicators, they are not to be admitted to Communion until after Public Penance. [41]

Here we have the three Canonical crimes again distinctly specified. The Pope goes on:

> If they have only committed the sin of taking part in pagan feasts and of eating meat offered to false gods, they can be purified by fastings and by the imposition of hands.

What is this "imposition of hands" with intent to cleanse? What else but a form of Penance administered by the Church? Not indeed Public Penance, against which it is distinguished. Then private Penance—sacramental Absolution!

The same fact emerges from a study of the ancient Penitentiaries, both Greek and Latin. They give forms of absolution identical for the beginning and for the end of the Public Penance. A Bishop usually performed the final reconciliation, but a priest at least (a deacon was not enough) was required for the initial rite which was called "absolution." Martène[42] has published a very ancient *Ordo*, in which the priest after having questioned and confessed the penitent, receives these directions:

> Then give the penitent a penance proportioned to the sins he has committed, as in the Penitentiary is set forth. Next let the priest absolve him, lest perchance sudden death should come upon him and he should quit this world (legatus) bound by sin.

IX.

WHAT WAS THE USE AND PURPOSE OF THE PUBLIC PENANCE?

We have shown that the Public Penance was given only for the three Canonical crimes, and was given only once. A far milder form of Penance was given; (1) to those sinners who fell a second time into a Canonical crime; to all other classes of sinners; to all clerics; and to all who were incapacitated by circumstances from performing the Public Penance. We have shown, moreover, that in the main, Public Penance was a grace permitted and not a punishment inflicted.

But in face of these facts an obvious difficulty suggests itself.

[41] Letter 168; Migne, liv. col. 1209.

[42] "De Antiquis Ecclesiæ ritibus," lib. i. c. 6, act 7: Ordo x.

Why should any penitent undergo this rigorous penance when he could have escaped so much more easily?

To this we reply that the Public Penance had points in its favor. For those early ages of faith it had special advantages, powerful attractions. It alone represented the full and perfect remission of sin, not only of the guilt, but also of the temporal punishment due after the guilt has been forgiven. It was equivalently a second baptism. Once the Public Penance was discharged, the penitent could joyously claim that there remained no soil of sin, no more temporal punishment, no more debts to pay—and that, no matter how long-lasting and how black his crimes had been—but innocence fully restored, a soul white with grace, and if he died then, a heaven open at once to receive him. This was a second baptism won on terms much more severe than those of the first baptism, and therefore called by the Fathers, *Baptismus Laboriosus*. Public Penance was a second baptism and therefore, like the first, could not be repeated. To us moderns all this is not easy to realize. We are always in a hurry, and, satisfied with the remission of guilt and the closing of the gates of Hell, we make less account of the "satisfaction"—which to some extent is a luxury of Penance. The difference is that the early Christians wiped away on earth that debt of temporal punishment which we moderns may—for all we know—have to account for in Purgatory by years of anguish. Hence we can understand that the Public Penance was regarded as a grace and not as the punishment of man.

Having by these rather disjointed notes to some extent cleared the way, we may now formally put to ourselves the question:

X.

DID AURICULAR CONFESSION EXIST IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH?

We reply by a Catena of the Fathers.

(*a*) Fifth Century.

It certainly existed in the fifth century, as the Lambeth Round Table Conference admitted.

St. Leo the Great (born 390) wrote to the Bishops of Campania:

> It is an abuse, contrary to the apostolic rule, which I have lately heard has been, by a piece of unlawful usurpation, preached by some, and which I order at once to be removed—viz., that when the faithful ask for penance, a written confession of their sins is publicly read aloud.
>
> It is enough that the guilt of consciences be revealed to priests alone in private confession. [43]

[43] "Reatus conscientiarum sufficit solis sacerdotibus indicare confessione secretâ." ("Epist." 168. "Ad Episc. Campaniæ et Samnii; Migne, liv. col. 1210.)

That is the evidence of the head of the Church in the middle of the fifth century--evidence, however, that the custom of Private Confession *had come down from the Apostles!*

So much for Italy in the fifth century. In the same century St. John Chrysostom, at Constantinople, who wrote in 403, said:[44]

> If you fall into sin, begin to do penance, and as often as you come to me, I will cure you.

Speaking for West Africa, St. Augustine (died in 430) expressed his pity for those who die "unbaptized or unabsolved." This passage we have quoted already. Again, in another place[45] he says:

> There is the same necessity for reconciliation (by the Sacrament of Penance) as there is for Baptism.

(*b*) Fourth Century.

The historian, Sozomen[46] declares that the institution of the Priest Penitentiary at Constantinople dates from the beginning of Christianity, and that his work was to hear private confessions.

St. Basil (born 330), speaking for Asia Minor, writes:[47]

> In the confession of sins there is the same notion as in the revelation of bodily defects. As men do not hastily lay open bodily ailments to people at random, but only to those who have the means to cure them, in like manner the confession of sins also ought to be made to those only who can cure them.

And who are these physicians of souls? St. Basil answers in Reg. 288 N.:

> Of necessity sins should be laid open to those to whom have been entrusted the "Mysteries of God."

And in the thirty-fourth Canon of St. Basil it is forbidden to denounce the crime of a woman's adultery *which the priest has known by Confession.*

St. Gregory of Nyssa (born 300) refers to the case of "secret theft" which the priest knows only by Confession.[48]

And, speaking for Syria, Aphraates (born 280) in his tractate on Penance says:

> As it does not shame a man, when he has been wounded in battle, to show himself to a wise physician and put himself in his hands, . . . so when a man has been overcome by the devil he is not in the least ashamed to confess his sin, and give it up, and ask for the medicine of penance. . . . Nor can a man be cured who is thus ashamed, seeing that he is unwilling to show his wounds to the physician.

And St. Ambrose (born 333), of Milan, says very clearly indeed[49] of the powers of binding and loosing:

---

44 Harduin, "Concilia," i. col. 1042.

45 "De Conjug. Adult." i. c. 28; Migne, xl. col. 470.

46 Lib. vii. c. 16.

47 "In. Reg. Brev." Reg. 229.

48 Epist. Canon. can. 6; Migne, "P. G." xiv. col. 233.

49 "De Pœnitentia," lib. i. c. 2, n. 7.

Both the Church possesses; heresy has neither. For this prerogative has been granted to priests alone.

And again:[50]

God has granted to His priests the power to remit all sins, without any exception.

(*c*) Third Century.

Origen of Alexandria (born 185)[51] speaks of the penitent who is not ashamed to reveal his fault to the priest of God and to ask him for a remedy:

Quum non erubescet sacerdoti Domini indicare peccatum suum et quærere medicinam.

And again he writes:[52]

The Holy Scripture teaches us that a man must not hide a sin within himself. Just as those with indigestion are eased and cured if they come to vomit, in like manner those who keep a secret sin in the depths of their conscience are oppressed and, as it were, stifled by the humous of the sin, but are eased as soon as they have vomited up that sin by accusing themselves and confessing it. . . Address yourself to an approved physician.

And, speaking for Africa (he became a Christian, 245), St. Cyprian writes:[53]

Let each confess his sin while he is yet on earth, while he has an opportunity of confession, while satisfaction and remission, made by priests, are grateful to the Lord.

And again:[54]

Those who, having committed idolatry only in thought, hasten to confess their fault sadly and simply to the priests of the Lord, do thus make exomologesis of their conscience, expose the burden of their soul, and ask for a salutary remedy for their wounds, however small or slight they may be.

Here and elsewhere the great Bishop of Carthage is referring to the secret confession that preceded Public Penance.

Auricular Confession, as we have now shown, prevailed in Italy, Africa, Constantinople and Asia Minor, that is, in the principal churches of Eeast and West, as far as can be gathered from documents of the fourth and third centuries. Sozomen and St. Leo affirm, moreover, that this custom goes back to the dawn of Christianity. Positive documents by which to prove this statement we do not possess. But neither is there any document that denies it. The statement, therefore, of the Fulham R. T. Conference that Private Confession arose about the fifth century has been proved to be utterly false.

Protestantism, however, has rejected not only Private, but also Public Penance. Yet the latter was just as much a sacrament as the former.

Charles Coupe, S. J.

Wimbleton College, England.

50 Cap. 3. n. 10.

51 "In Leviticum," Homil. ii. c. 4; Migne, xii. p. 418.

52 "In Psal." 37, Homil. ii.; Migne, xii. col. 1386.

53 "De Lapsis," n. 29.

54 Id. ib. n. 28.

DANTE'S MADONNA.

"Benedetta tue nelle figlie d' Adamo, e benedette sieno in eterno le bellezze tue."—Purg. 29, 85.

IT IS not difficult to see in Dante a herald of religious revolt, if we have eyes only for his differences with ecclesiastical superiors. Modern writers have so insisted on this opposition to authority that they have persuaded themselves and many others that the great Florentine was the precursor of a reform taken up by Savonarola and consummated by Luther. This claim to notoriety Dante would have been the first to repudiate. At the same time his outspoken condemnation of Popes and Cardinals, together with his imprudent zeal for the reform of abuses, have given color to the accusation and made the task of vindication far from easy. Yet we have Dr. Moore's authority for the statement that Dante's view on the relation of Church and State "is the chief, if not the only, subject on which Dante is really found in serious opposition to the generally accepted teaching of the Church."[1] This vexed question it is not our present intention to discuss. We merely remark in passing that ecclesiastical politics and religious faith are by no means convertible terms. Vigorous and ill-timed denunciations of abuses in discipline or practice do not necessarily involve a charge of error in doctrine. The omission to note this vital distinction leads to the most unjust estimate of many orthodox reformers and not a few saints. Personal prejudice and rancor almost inevitably play a large part in the domain of ecclesiastical politics, and this was notably the case in the Middle Ages. The surest way of judging of Dante's orthodoxy seems to be to turn to his views on matters purely theological. Here we have no personal bias or rancor to discount—a difficult element to gauge at all times, but especially after the lapse of centuries. Here Dante stands revealed as a loyal son of the Church. He is never at fault when expounding such delicate points as the authority of Holy Scripture, the necessity of faith and the doctrine of Purgatory. He is conspicuously a Catholic in his conception of the greatest privileges of the Mother of God. True, he has not left us a treatise on this sublime theme, though one feels he could have anticipated the devotional books of St. Alphonsus. For Dante's appreciation of Our Lady we must search through the pages of his poetry and prose. The numerous references to be found there must be considered as so many touches building up the perfect portrait. And when these delicate touches are brought together and laid one on another on the same canvas they present

[1] "Studies," Second Series.

a picture surprisingly complete. One feels that here if anywhere in literature is the Madonna of Christian art painted in words. It has lost nothing of its brilliant coloring and sweetness of expression; it has gained much in idealism and love for the human race.

To give some faint idea of Dante's Madonna, I propose to collate the more striking passages scattered through Dante's works. They naturally fall into four groups; viz., references to Our Lady's life, her physical beauty, her moral excellence and her power of intercession. For the sake of clearness it will be well to treat of them in this order.

The faithfulness with which Dante popularized the teaching of theologians, such as St. Bernard and St. Thomas Aquinas, must be incidentally noted, for it is our object to show that Dante's view of the Blessed Virgin is not novel, but strictly orthodox. The intensity of his love for the Mother of God needs no emphasis. We can readily believe him when he tells us that he invoked her name morning and evening in his prayers. It was his deep reverence for the "Blessed Mary" that forbade all mention of that name in the accursed regions of hell. To quote Dr. Moore again: "In the exalted position assigned by Dante to the Blessed Virgin as the Queen of Heaven, and the enthusiastic language in which he speaks of her, we recognize the expression not only of theological doctrine . . . but also of deep personal devotion."

First, I will give as exactly as possible the life of Our Lady as found up and down Dante's pages. Maria—la baldezza e l'onore dell'umana generazione—was of the line of David, the son of Jesse.[2] She was the daughter of Joachim and Anne;[3] of Anne who in Paradise gazes so long and so lovingly on her daughter that her eyes are never seen to wander from her. The poet takes it for granted that Our Lady was thirteen years old at the time of the Annunciation—giovinetta donzella di tredici anni.[4] By her humble "Ecce ancilla Domini" she became "the one only bride of the Holy Ghost."[5] This mystery of the Annunciation is reënacted in the Heaven of the Fixed Stars. There Gabriel is the attendant angel on the Mother of God. Again he spreads his wings before the Queen who so enamored him. The whole court takes up the strains of his Ave Maria. It is explained to Dante that by reason of this sublime mission long ago "exultancy and winsomeness, as much as there may be in angel or in soul, is all in him (*sc.* Gabriel); and we would have it so, for he it is who brought down the palm to

---

2 Conv. 4-5, 40.
3 Conv. 2-6, 14.
4 Conv. 2-6, 24.
5 Purg. 20, 97.

Mary, when the Son of God willed to load Himself with our burden."[6] And the angel's description of his own office is not less beautiful: "I am angelic love, who circle round the joy sublime which breathes from out the womb that was the hostelry of our desire; and I will circle, Lady of Heaven, until thou followest thy Son, and makest more divine the sphere supreme."[7]

"Mary ran with haste into the hill country" is the cry of the slothful in Purgatory, as they are hurried along to their punishment. In the earthly paradise the twenty-four elders chant their blessings on the Virgin in words similar to those used by St. Elizabeth: "Blessed art thou among the daughters of Adam, and blessed to all eternity be thy beauties."[8]

We have reference in De Monarchia (2, 12) to the edict of Cæsar ordering the enrolment. To prove that the "Romanum imperium" is de jure, the patriot claims that Christ's obedience proves beyond a doubt that this edict was from a just source—nay, divine. "Forte sanctius est arbitrari, divinitus illud exivisse per Cæsarem." In the fifth circle of Purgatory, one of the shades pathetically reminds the avaricious and prodigal of the extreme poverty and wretchedness of the stable of Bethlehem.

No sooner had the poet reached the prison house of the wrathful[9] than he saw in an ecstasy the scene of the finding in the Temple. He beholds a woman about to enter, with the tender attitude of a mother, saying, "My Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us?"

"They have no wine" is uttered by a spirit, invisible to the travelers, in the second circle, where the envious are being purified from their sins. We have no mention of Our Lady during the years when her Divine Son was growing from youth to manhood, nor during the three years of His ministry. But in the tragedy of the crucifixion Mary is found at her rightful place, the foot of the Cross.[10]

It will be remarked that Dante's references to the mysteries of Our Lady's life are merely incidental. Though no new light is thrown upon these sacred themes these casual allusions serve at least one good purpose. They show us that these mysteries were evidently familiar to the generation for which the poem was written. The same events, then as now, were held as certain by Catholic tradition. As a matter of fact, Dante's purpose was in no wise to enumerate the facts of Our Lady's life. He is in search of examples with which to adorn the terraces of Purgatory. Each of the seven

[6] Par. 32, 109.
[7] Par. 23, 105.
[8] Purg. 29, 85.
[9] Purg. 15, 85.
[10] Purg. 33, 5; par. 11, 71.

terraces is set aside for the purification of souls tainted by one or other of the seven deadly sins. By way of instruction to the visitor and by way of encouragement to the sufferer a motto and an example of the opposite virtue is provided in each terrace. The life of Our Lady, the model of all virtues, furnishes an episode to illustrate the beauty of the seven contrary virtues. Pride finds its antithesis in the "Ecce ancilla Domini;" envy, in the ineffable love of one's neighbor shown at Cana; anger, in the calmness and restraint of the query "Why hast Thou done so to us?" sloth, in the haste with which Mary went to her cousin's aid; avarice is put to shame by the poverty of Bethlehem. To these incidents reference has already been made.

Two of the capital sins still remain—the sins of gluttony and of lust. As an antidote to the former, the marriage feast is again recalled. Mary thought more how the feast might be honorable and complete than of her own mouth.[11] The last terrace contains the souls stained with lust. There they are seen passing and repassing through purifying flames, the while glorifying God's mercy in their "summæ Deus clementiæ." This finished, they repeat in unison Mary's words to the angel, "I know not man," and softly begin their hymn again. This effective way of illustrating the several virtues is evidently taken from St. Bonaventure's speculum B. V. M. After declaring in a general way that the Blessed Virgin was free from every stain and adorned with every virtue, the saint explains more explicitly how she was most free (immunissima) from the seven deadly sins. He then enumerates the virtues which the Blessed Virgin exhibited in direct contrast. "To pride, she opposed humility most lowly; to envy, charity most loving; to sloth, diligence most unwearied; to anger, meekness most gentle; to avarice, poverty most straitened; to gluttony, sobriety most temperate; to sensuality, virginity most chaste."[12] What makes one all the more think Dante had this passage before him is the fact that though there are very different enumerations of the virtues in mediæval books, that of the Purgatorio follows strictly the order found in the Speculum. It is worth noting that the English writers Chaucer and Gower preserve the same sequence.

To the last mystery of Our Lady's life we have more than a passing allusion. The remarkable scene,[13] already referred to, represents undoubtedly the mystery of the Assumption as well as that of the Incarnation. One might call it a tableau vivant illustrative at once of the source of Our Lady's glory and its crown. Elsewhere[14]

ii Purg. 22, 1042.

12 Spec., B. M. V., lect. iv.

13 Par. 23, 105.

14 Par. 25, 127.

the poet tells us that "Christ and His Mother alone have ascended into heaven clad in their two robes" (*i. e.*, of body as well as soul). From this it is not rash to conclude that he accepted the tradition, common in the Middle Ages, regarding Enoch and Elias. When they were taken bodily from the earth they were believed to be placed, not in heaven, but in the earthly paradise. But to return to the vision of the Assumption. Our Lady appears as the Rose in the midst of the garden of lilies—to wit, the Apostles. As soon as the poet's eyes grew accustomed to the dazzling beauty of this meadow of flowers he beholds the angel Gabriel—in the form of a tiny torch—descend to crown the Rose. To the evident delight of the whole company of saints and angels, she is caught up from their midst and passes upwards to the highest heaven, while the air is filled with the sweet melody of the Regina cœli. The traveler does not again see the Blessed Virgin until he has been entrusted by Beatrice to the care of St. Bernard and reaches the Empyrean itself. Here the saint's first injunction is that Dante must put all his trust in the Queen of Heaven and mark the most remote circle where she sits enthroned. The brilliance of this court supreme of light and love surpasses everything seen before. But even there the glory of the Blessed Virgin is unmistakable. He is bidden to gaze on "the face that most resembles Christ; for its brightness only is able to prepare thee to see Christ." He gazes long and lovingly, for, to quote his own words, "all that I had seen before o'erpowered me not with so great wonder, nor showed me so great semblance of God."[15] By a few masterly strokes such as these the poet conveys to the reader's mind all that art had tried to express concerning the form and feature of Our Blessed Lady. It is not without significance that Dante, the realist, does not attempt a detailed description of her as she appeared to him. His method is, in fact, very similar to the one he has recourse to when describing the Beatific Vision itself. It is impossible to put into words the Vision of the Godhead; he therefore describes the visible effects of that Presence on the Court around and on himself. So here he hints at Our Lady's beauty as it is reflected in her subjects. For instance, "her beauty wrought gladness in the eyes of all the other saints;" the angel of the Annunciation with constant gazing on her seemed all aflame; Adam and St. Peter sit on her right and left enraptured, as is also her holy mother Anne. Most significant of all, the brightness of her countenance is the last discipline and only fit preparation before admission to the Beatific Vision.

The poet contents himself with describing her surpassing beauty in this general way. Nowhere does he fill in the details of the

[15] Par. 32, 85-93.

picture, as he never fails to do in the case of Beatrice and others. This reserve is full of meaning for any one who has studied the Madonna in Christian art and song. From early times it was admitted that no true picture of the Blessed Virgin existed. St. Augustine said so in as many words. In course of time it was claimed that a true picture did exist. Artists set to work to copy the so-called "Luke Madonna," and the result was their art became cramped. Decadance was bound to follow from this fallacy of making The Perfect Woman anatomically correct and of imagining that one type of beauty was all sufficient. The great artists who followed shook themselves free from these restrictions and painted after their own fancy. The result was more satisfactory. Representations of the Madonna became almost infinite in variety. None claimed to be true, but all strove to express a common ideal—what each master considered the embodiment of purity and beauty. From this very variety of expression the idea of Our Lady's beauty gained immeasurable grandeur and power.

Another important principle they came to recognize was that the ideal of Our Lady's perfections, though always exceeding their power, was nearer their grasp than the beauty of her Divine Son. And so some artists painted first their Madonna and then a child closely resembling her in features. In this we discover the influence of earlier writers and poets. The application of the old adage, "Filii Matrizant," recurs again and again in their descriptions of the Madonna and Child. They lay stress on the fact that this general law of maternity is morally certain in the case of Christ, because He was the Son of a *Virgin* Mother. Another reason urged in support of this same law of likeness is that love increases and intensifies resemblance of face and disposition. I will quote St. John Damascene: "Ave flos prae cunctis tinctorum coloribus varium omni virtute condimentum, ex sua flos flori similis, matrem exacte referens, consurgit."[16] I have referred at length to this close likeness of Mother and Son as it was undoubtedly a strong tradition in the thirteenth century. One cannot help thinking that this tradition restrained Dante from describing Our Lady as minutely as did the Eastern Fathers, with all the gorgeousness of Eastern coloring. On the other hand, the same tradition surely inspired that most poetic verse:

> Riguarda omai nella faccia ch'a Christo
> Più si somiglia, chè la sua chiarezza
> Sola ti può disporre a veder Cristo.
>
> —(Par. 32, 85.)[17]

[16] Hom. 2, in Nativ. B. M. V.

[17] Look now into the face that unto Christ hath most resemblance; for its brightness only is able to prepare thee to see Christ.

Ineffable as is the natural beauty of Our Lady, Dante would not have us imagine it is her chief excellence. It is not on this account that she is so like to God and makes diviner the sphere supreme. Her charms without but reflect the beauty of the king's daughter within. Denis the Carthusian declares it to be a credible and even certain doctrine that Mary's body and features were a revelation of the fullness of grace in her soul.[18] On earth her perfect symmetry of form and color was excelled only by her gifts of virtue and grace. And if so perfect during the time of exile, how entrancing the sight of her in glory. Dante says simply that all the brilliant pageant in the lower heavens—the array of doctors and warriors, the glories of Apostles and angels—gave him no such glimpse of God. Queen of Heaven, she is placed by the poet high beyond all other creatures, for she unites in her sacred person whatever good there is in creatures.[19] There she is found to excel as here (*i. e.*, on earth) she excelled.[20] She excels all others, as east surpasses west on a summer morn.[21] In St. Peter Chrysologus we trace the germ of this same idea. "Hail, full of grace," he exclaims. "Others have shared in grace divine, but on Mary its fullness was showered once and for all."[22] Her place in heaven is the highest, not merely because she found most merit in the eyes of her Creator, but because she has been made to share the royalty of her Son. He has made subject to His Mother all created beings that she might receive homage from them. Her love, says Albert the Great, is more ardent than that of the Seraphim, her knowledge more profound than that of the Cherubim, her authority over the devil more potent than that of the powers and virtues; in a word, she is the incomparable one. To typify all this she is seen in vision[23] to mount upwards through the ranks of confessors, of martyrs, of virgins, through the choirs of angels, and take her place next "her own seed." According to Catholic tradition, divine maternity is the source and principle of her superiority over the rest of creation. The title of Mother of God was felt from the earliest times to include all other titles and favors. Dante draws the same conclusion in his own way. Because, so he argues in the Convito, everything had to be in the best disposition for the coming of God, His Mother had to be the noblest of creatures—la femmina ottima. We have already alluded to other titles found in the "Commedia," now numbered among our litany invocations. Another worth mentioning is that of the Rosa Mys-

[18] De Laudibus B. V., lib. 2.
[19] Par. 33.
[20] Par. 23.
[21] Par. 31.
[22] Serm. 143, de Annunc.
[23] Par. 23.

tica. More than a thousand angels hover round her while Gabriel spreads his wings before. At her feet sits Eve, who caused the wound that Mary healed.

The deep affection the saints and angels bear her is shown by the loving way these gleams of light reach upward after her. The Empyrean—the tenth and last in ascending order of importance—is declared by St. Bernard to be subject and devoted to the enthroned Queen. The nine choirs of angels have charge of the lower spheres. Our Lady reigns supreme over the one next the Awful Presence Chamber. The whole realm resounds with her praises, and on every side is heard the Canticle, "Ave Maria gratia plena." In return for their loving service and affection, the saints and angels are "happier made at each new ministering." The words on St. Bernard's lips are these:

> Qui sei a noi meridiana face
> Di caritate, e giuso, intra i mortali,
> Sei di speranza fontana vivace —(Par. 33, 10.) [24]

This does not, of course, imply that the Beatific Vision is insufficient for the happiness of the blessed. It has reference simply to the "accidental glory," which theologians—St. Thomas chief of all—hold to be capable of increase. Hence the soundness of the pious belief that Mary's clients will reap a reward denied to others.

The plenitude of grace enjoyed by Our Lady naturally suggests its corrollary—her power of mediation between God and man. Dante's utterances on this point of doctrine are in happy contrast to those of heretics before and after his day. As is well known, some of these detractors, Luther, for example, insisted that the saints, the Blessed Virgin included, had only a dim knowledge of our difficulties and necessities. Because their knowledge was so limited, they could not, if they would, interest themselves in our petty concerns. Others pretended to exalt Our Lady by assuming she was too far removed to interest herself in us. Having reached such a high place in glory, she would not condescend to intercede for sinners. Dante knows no such limitations or supineness.

First, as to Our Lady's knowledge of our wants. Dante is at one with his master, St. Thomas, as I pointed out in a former Review.[25] "In the Beatific Vision," writes the Angelic Doctor, "the saints see whatever goes to fill up the cup of their happiness. One happiness in heaven must surely be to help their clients; for in this, according to the Areopagite, they coöperate in the most divine works. It is certain, therefore, that they see in the Word the vows and the prayers of those who pray to them for help."[26] It necessarily follows

[24] Here unto us thou art a noonday torch of Charity, and below there among mortals Thou art the living fountain-head of Hope.

[25] July, 1902.

[26] In Sent., iv. D. 45.

that Our Lady, by reason of her deeper vision, understands better than all the blessed our necessities and our prayers. The poet graphically describes how she hears the cry of misery even before it is uttered:

> La tua benignita non pur soccorre
> A chi domanda, ma molte fiate
> Liberamente al domandar precorre.—(Par. 33, 16.) [27]

Next, knowing our wants, is she able and willing to help? Dante's conception of Our Lady's power is identical with that of St. Bernard and St. Alphonsus. One passage from the first-named will be sufficient to recall that conception: "Let us ask for grace, and let us ask it through Mary, because she obtains whatever she asks for, and cannot be denied."[28]

This beautiful thought finds its echo in the saint's prayer for Dante, when every grace has been granted except a glimpse of the Infinite:

> Perchè tu ogni nube gli disleghi
> Di sua mortalità coi preghi tuoi,
> Si che il sommo piacer gli si dispieghi
> Ancor ti prego, Regina che puoi
> Ciò che tu vuoli, che conservi sani,
> Dopo tanto veder, gli affetti suoi. —(Par. 33, 31.) [29]

Whether this striking passage be taken apart from the context or taken with the context, whether it be looked upon as an expression of personal or of popular devotion, its burden is the same. It is the phrase so often on the lips of St. Alphonsus: "All graces through Mary." It is the grand prerogative which heretics begrudge her, though given her without scruple by a St. Anselm, a St. John Damascene and a St. Bonaventure.[30] The action of the whole trilogy is designed to give practical illustration of man's utter dependence on Our Lady's intercession. St. Bernard had laid it down as a first principle that the Blessed Virgin is the only way of mounting up to God, because she is the only way by which God chose to descend to us.[31] The "Divine Comedy" is full of this idea. The initial grace to put off mortality for a time and breathe the immortal,

---

[27] Not only thy benignity gives succor to him who asketh it, but oftentimes forerunneth of its own accord the asking.

Note.—This thought would seem to be borrowed from Richard of S. Victor. Exposit. in Cant. xxiii. "Velocius occurrit ejus pieta quam invocetur et causas miserorum anticipat."

[28] In Nativ. B. M. V. Brev. Rom., 24th May, Lect. 9.

[29] That thou wouldst scatter from him every cloud of his mortality, so with thy prayers,
That the chief pleasure be to him displayed.
Still further do I pray thee, Queen, who canst
Whate'er thou wilt, that sound thou mayst preserve, after so great a vision his affections.

[30] Glories of Mary. C. 5.

[31] Serm. 2 in Adventu.

the grace of constant protection and guidance through the horrors of hell, the sorrows of Purgatory and the brilliance of heaven are sought and obtained at the hands of Mary. Commentators are careful to explain that the "donna gentil nel ciel" who sent Lucia to Beatrice, Beatrice to Virgil, Virgil to Dante is the symbol of prevenient grace. Symbolism undoubtedly underlies all these characters, and it would be folly to ignore it. But if too much stress be laid on this symbolism, the living personalities cease to stand out as clearly as they do in the written page. There is a danger of their becoming theological formulæ and nothing more. The Madonna of the closing scene of the "Paradiso" is above and before all a living person. And in the lines last quoted Dante would have his readers infer two home truths about Our Lady's power with God. One is that man's final perseverance depends on Mary's prayers. Dante's days of trial are not yet over. After the momentary vision of God in glory he will have to return to earth and work out his salvation. In spite of all he has been privileged to see, he may fall into sin and forfeit eternal happiness. Mary is his security in this uncertainty, as she is for every one in this Vale of Tears. The other truth, more than implied, is that the sight of the Beatific Vision depends on the prayers of the Queen of Heaven. So confident are the Fathers of this that they apply to her the words which Christ spoke of His Eternal Father. "Unless the Father draw him, no one can come to the Son" is thus adapted by them: "No one can come to the Son unless the Mother draw him." To obtain the crowning grace—the one to which his long and wonderful journey was always tending, and for which his soul had been now purified and strengthened—the pilgrim is commanded to turn to Mary, "who alone has power to aid." Beatrice and all the saints join in St. Bernard's prayer for Dante, persuaded that if they can prevail on the Blessed Virgin his cause is won and his desire certain to be gratified. The reason of their confidence is given. She is the Queen "who can do what she wills."[32] Taken by itself, this expression is a remarkable one. Dante has twice before made use of the same words to describe the omnipotence of God.[33] Here it is the poet's profession of faith in Our Lady's dignity and prerogatives, and at the same time a summary of his former teaching. He is not detracting from the omnipotence of God. He is only insisting on the great truth that the Mother of God is never refused when she espouses a cause. In any necessity, in any danger, man has but to secure her ear. Mary will do the rest.

---

[32] Cf. "Habes enim, novi, parem cum voluntat facultatem, tamquam Altissimi Parens." S. Germ. Consti., in Ingressum S. S. Deiparæ, Serm. 2.

[33] Inf. 3.95; 5.33.

This is the last touch Dante gives to his picture of the Madonna. Her power of intercession is supreme. In the final tableau of the "Divine Comedy" we are in presence of the same "Orante" that is rudely sketched on the walls of the Catacombs. Between the second and the eighteenth century other titles have been found for Our Lady, other honors of hers have come to be recognized, but her most gracious office is still the same—to pray and supplicate for her children on earth.

FRANCIS DE CAPITAIN.

Birmingham, England.

THE NEW APOLOGETIC.

THERE is said to have been discovered a new method of apologetic. It is attributed to a French layman, M. Maurice Blondel, and appears chiefly in his work entitled "Action." It has an exponent in English in the person of Father Tyrrell, S. J., who utilizes it almost throughout his earlier works, "Nova and Vetera," "Hard Sayings," "External Religion" and "Faith of the Millions," and states it formally in his latest work, "Lex Orandi." It is something new only in so far as it is a new way of approaching old truths. Just as the four evangelists looked at the life of Christ from different points of view, so we now may behold the Catholic Faith from different points of view. Hitherto theologians have had glimpses of this new aspect of things, but not until now have they formulated and emphasized it.

The leading characteristic then of the new method may be said to be this, that it is subjective rather than objective. In the usual text-books of apologetics the arguments are practically all external and objective. We have, for instance, the five proofs of St. Thomas for the existence of God, motion, efficient cause, contingency, grades and design; for the claims of the Roman Church, the authority of Scriptures and the four external marks; for the articles of the creed, the definitions of the general councils. Nearly the whole, in fact, of a priest's theological training is spent in trying to master these external proofs.

Now the new apologetic regards these external proofs as absolutely necessary, but at the same time as quite secondary and altogether insufficient. Their insufficiency lies in the fact that they do not appeal to the whole man. They appeal only to his reason and intelligence, whereas reason and intelligence are but a part of man's being. There is a part to which they do not appeal, or not

necessarily, namely, his will and affections. Now the will and affections are the chief motive power in man, and consequently in matters pertaining to faith the will and affections are of far more importance than the reason and intelligence. Before a man can arrive at the Faith, he must first have an inclination towards it, the "pius credulitatis affectus." That affection is set at liberty and justified by the reason. Thus the affection and the reason are each necessary to the other, the one, however, being the cause of faith, the other its condition.

Again, the faith is not merely an opinion nor yet merely a school of thought; but it is a life and is lived by the whole man. It is not merely an object of intellectual entertainment and school room disputation, neither is it a fashion just for Sunday use; but it is a life which is always with us, which permeates all our actions, which informs every human act, which is lived day after day and all day. Consequently it must appeal to the whole man, not only to his intellect, but also to his heart and affections.

The whole man was made for God and religion was the tie made to bind him to God. Consequently in man is to be found an exigency and a need for God and religion; and this not merely in a vague and general sort of way, but in all the details of the Catholic creed. This exigency or longing or thirst may be dormant or undeveloped; still none the less there and only waiting to be set free by the action of the intellect.

The new method of apologetic, then, engages to point out to the unbeliever this fitness and aptitude of his soul for God and religion. It makes for his will and affections by dilating on the usefulness and beauty of religion, insisting all along that that which is universally useful and fair must be true.

Further, following the theology of St. Thomas, it assumes that we are dealing with human nature as we find it, not as it might have been. Human nature as it now exists is not the technical "status purae naturae" which could have no exigency for a supernatural religion, but it is a nature in which the natural is permeated with and related to the supernatural, and as such it has a need of the supernatural religion for which it was destined, namely, the whole Catholic Faith. It is as Tertullian says, "naturaliter Christiana;" it seeks for and rests nowhere else but in the bosom of God; it lives in the Christian religion as its own natural atmosphere.

Seeing then that there is in man this thirst and craving for God and religion, it follows that man must endeavor to satisfy that thirst and craving. If he finds a void or vacancy in his heart he will seek to find its complement; in a word, he will endeavor to unite his heart and soul to God, that is, he will pray. In praying, however, he

will only seek those things for which he feels the need, the things which satisfy the demands of his soul. But since the soul is "naturaliter Christiana" it will feel the need of the Christian revelation only. Thus the object of his prayer becomes identical with the object of his belief; hence the maxim: the standard of prayer is the standard of faith, "Lex orandi, Lex credendi." This does not mean that the soul, even in its present supernaturalized state, could by its own efforts arrive at a revealed mystery, say, for instance, that of the Blessed Trinity; but that, once the mystery is revealed, the human soul by its predisposition accepts it as its own proper complement. Also by this predisposition the soul will reject everything alien to its Christian nature. Thus it is said "the Catholic doctrine is far less a creation of theological reflection than of selective power of the Christian spirit rejecting the variations of heretical curiosity—Arian, Nestorian, Monophysite—as inadequate to its needs or untrue to the laws of its life."

Neither is this selective power to be extended to every pious impulse and imagination of every individual soul; nor yet to the devotions of various companies of souls, but to the whole body of the faithful. It is only in and through the whole body of the faithful that we get the aspirations and yearning of the collective Christian soul, and it is only in and through the collective Christian soul that we have the assured guidance of the Holy Spirit. "Hence it is that no man can take his own subjective and separate experience as a sufficient test. If he is to develop a healthy individuality he must first appropriate and master what is common to all; he must correct his eccentricities by the teaching of the Church, that is, by the consensus of experts in the art of charity." Thus a special impulse may be given here and there by an individual saint, by a particular confraternity, by a religious order, by a local church; but only in so far as it is taken up and adopted by the whole Catholic Church is it the expression of the collective Christian soul; and only in so far as it is the expression and prayer of the collective Christian soul is it a statement of Catholic faith.

Here then, I think, we have the main outline of the new method. Now we may consider some of its advantages and disadvantages.

The first obvious advantage is that it gives the apologist a due sense of proportion as to the value of scholastic theology. Scholasticism was ever meant to be and ever will be the handmaid of religion; but merely the handmaid, and the scholastic theologian has need to examine his conscience whether he has not been endeavoring to exalt the handmaid into the position of mistress. The Christian revelation was revealed to babes and sucklings and in the language of babes and sucklings. In the course of time as that

revelation was explained and defined it was embodied in the language of Aristotle and the peripatetics. It has come down to us embodied in that language as a jewel in a casket, and the apologist who will avail himself of the theological thought of the scholastic age must familiarize himself with scholastic language. But he must ever remember that his mission is to the present age, which present age no longer speaks in Aristotelian terms. And more, not only is scholastic language not current, but scholastic method would seem to have little attraction for the modern spirit. Take, for instance, the use of the syllogism. "This universal living scene of things," writes Cardinal Newman, "is after all as little a logical world as it is a poetical; and, as it cannot without violence be exalted into poetical perfection, neither can it be attenuated into a logical formula." And again: "We are not able to prove by syllogism that there are any self-evident propositions at all; but supposing there are (as of course I hold there are) still who can determine these by logic? Syllogism, then, though of course it has its use, still does only the minutest and easiest part of the work in the investigation of truth, for when there is any difficulty, that difficulty commonly lies in determining first principles, not in the arrangement of proofs." And once more: "Logic then does not really prove; it enables us to join issue with others; it suggests ideas; it opens views; it maps out for us the lines of thought; it verifies negatively; it determines when differences of opinion are hopeless, and when and how far conclusions are probable; but for genuine proof in concrete matter we require an *organon* more delicate, versatile and elastic than verbal argumentation."*

This *organon* is provided by the new apologetic in the "whole man," the man not with his intellect only, but also with his heart, his temperament, his affections, his religious sense. Or, again, take the scholastic statement of the distinction between intellect and sense. Certainly one of the most pestilential errors of the day is the identification of these faculties, and the scholastic theologian renders signal service to religion in emphasizing their essential distinction. But has he not need to examine his conscience whether, whilst insisting on the essential distinction, he has not undervalued their intimate connection even though it be only accidental? Take, for instance, the problem of the origin of evil. Nearly all the difficulties which arise from it touch the feelings and the imagination. "Why should I suffer so?" asks the poor sufferer, lingering in a long and painful illness. "For my sins? But my friend here suffers more, and he has no sins." The enigma is not altogether intellectual, but one touching the whole being: intellect, imagination, temperament, everything.

*Grammar of Assent, 268-270.

And in dealing with it in the concrete, reason, the white light of intellect as it is called, is powerless. The new apologetic therefore would seek for an answer which would appeal to the whole man and would offer the considerations best suited to the man's temperament. If the individual were a soulless, passionless sort of person, it would naturally choose arguments drawn from justice, retribution and positive law; but if the individual were a person of feeling and emotion—and this would be the case with most men and with all women—then it would choose æsthetic considerations, say the fitness of vicarious suffering or the beauty and attractiveness of suffering as an expression of love. And in thus appealing to the whole man it need never be at a loss for an answer when face to face with awkward questions drawn from reason. Having admitted the insufficiency and limitations of reason, it can have recourse to the mysteriousness of God's wisdom and love, it can admit that there are hard sayings impossible to reconcile with our understanding; but since God is infinitely good, beautiful, wise and true, everything will eventually turn out to have been the best possible arrangement, and God will be seen to have been right after all.

Another advantage of the new method is that it helps to develop and increase the life of faith. So far we have touched only upon its value as a means of arriving at faith and of retaining the essence of faith in the presence of danger. But it goes much further. Its principles may be extended beyond the realms of dogmatic and moral into those of mystical and ascetical theology. Just as the soul looks into itself and finds a need and exigency for God, so also it looks into its higher aspirations and finds that their only chance of realization is in God. Just as in the essence of faith appeal is made to the whole man, so also in the superstructure, namely, the ascetic life, appeal is made to the whole man. The new apologetic sees in all natural loves only so many new ways of loving God. "If a man love not his brother, whom he hath seen, how can he love God, whom he hath not seen? *i. e.*, if a man is void of natural affection, how can he pretend to the supernatural? If he does not know what it is to love as a child, as a parent, a husband, a master, a friend, how can he pretend to that love which contains all these loves eminently—the love of Him who is father, spouse, friend, brother, child all in one?" In this respect it affords a very good corrective to exaggerated ascetics and false conscience. In theory we all admit that human passions and affections are good as entities, and that they are a help to salvation as long as they are kept under the control of reason and do not lead to any breach of the ten commandments. But in practice there is often a mistaken zeal which, looking upon the passions and affections as so many pitfalls, seeks for a remedy

in stifling and crushing them. The new method would rather utilize them by spiritualizing them and directing them to the service of religion. Hence we find that it makes full use of such portions of Holy Scripture as the Canticle of Canticles and of erratic poets such as Coventry Patmore. Of St. Paul on parting from the ancients of the Church at Ephesus it is written: And there was great weeping on all hands and they fell on Paul's neck and kissed him, sorrowing most of all because he had said they should see his face no more. "Making all due allowances for national temperament, there is here a large residue of feeling which certain Christian stoics would consider very human, very natural and therefore very wicked; and certainly St. Paul seems to have been consenting unto their deeds."

The chief objection to the new method is that it tends to do away with responsibility in the matter of faith in so far as it reduces the question to one of temperament; and, again, that it is calculated to destroy all solid piety, inasmuch as the motives are based on the feelings rather than on the reason. Emotion, poetry and romance, Coventry Patmore and Watson, it is said, may be very good as the foundation of Methodism or any religion where faith comes to us in a material form and remains with us in the shape of something like a piece of hard pudding that has fixed itself in the gullet; but these things will not do for Catholics, simply because such piety is not lasting, and even while it lasts is not based on the right motives.

The objection savors of the fallacy, "ignoratio elenchi." The "affective" apologist does not wish to undervalue the use of reason; nay, rather, he insists upon it as a necessary though secondary factor in the method. Certainly the suggested danger is present if "affective" theology is used exclusively. Just as scholasticism, taken alone, would tend to intellectualism and ever fail to touch the heart of man, just as moral theology taken alone would tend to a low standard of spirituality and ever fail to produce a saint, so might "affective" theology, taken alone, tend to mere emotion and ever fail to produce real and lasting faith and sanctity. And yet it may be that temperament has much more to do with religion than we have hitherto supposed. The new method certainly throws light on the nature of many conversions, those, for instance, for which no tangible reason could be assigned beyond that they were the effect of grace. Likewise does it throw light on those unfortunate cases of persons who are said to have read themselves into the Church and read themselves out again. A religious temperament is a great grace, and rather than diminish responsibility it increases it; for the less religious the temperament is, the more need it has of religious cultivation, and the more religious it is, the greater care it requires in order that it may produce its full complement of fruit. On the

other hand a defective temperament may go far as an excuse for defective faith. Indeed the question has already been asked: Seeing that a man may inculpably be devoid of faith through weak intelligence, may he not also be equally inculpably devoid of faith through a defective æsthetic sense or unreligious temperament? And the answer would seem to be in the affirmative.

Another objection regards the propriety of using certain of the natural affections as analogies of the affections between God and us. Of course it is understood that we make use only of *ordinate* affections. Now even within the limits laid down by moral theology there is a wide range of possibilities. The apologist, therefore, in his choice, must have due regard to the nature of his audience. It may be that there are select souls to whom the symbols in the Canticle of Canticles would be of the greatest service, but for the majority they are scarcely suitable. St. Teresa tells us how they delighted her nuns and herself, but how they only excited laughter in a general church congregation.

To dilate on the ecstatic joys of the unitive way would be as much out of place before a congregation of Birmingham shopkeepers as would a sermon on the æsthetics of sobriety and honesty before a congregation of contemplative nuns.

"Affective" theology, therefore, must be used with discretion. That the new method is not intended to exclude the older and commoner method may be seen from the following passage from "Faith of the Millions," with which we may conclude: "Nothing, perhaps, is more unintelligible to the Protestant critic of Catholicism, nothing more needs to be brought out prominently than the firm hold our religion can exercise over souls that are naturally irreligious. Her (the Church's) first thought is for the multitudes of average humanity who are not and cannot be in intelligent sympathy with many of the commands she lays upon them. . . . We recognize, therefore, that there is a certain serviceable fustian every-day piety, where together with a great deal of spiritual coarseness, insensibility to venial sin and imperfection, there exists a firm faith that would go cheerfully to the stake rather than deny God or offend Him in any grave point."

Thomas J. Gerrard.

New Hall, Chelmsford, England.

GREAT CATHOLIC SOLDIERS: PRINCE EUGENE, VICAR GENERAL.

IT IS difficult to find, among the great military captains of the past or the more recent days, one who exhibited qualities of high statesmanship and learning as well as preëminent military genius. Still more rare is it to find the magnanimous mind of the humanitarian as well as the wisdom of the philosopher uniting with those masterly qualities, in the one individual, to produce a paragon among generals. Wallenstein, William of Orange, Bonaparte were men who along with being great soldiers might lay claim to a certain degree of statesmanship. But as this was in each case along the line of personal ambition, and had for objective the ultimate idea of personal or family aggrandizement, the military wreath is, after all, the only one that justice has accorded their memory. One of the notable commanders in the eighteenth century wars in Europe, Prince Eugène, was, perhaps, the best example of this rare combination that history affords. His reputation has been, for reasons not easily explained, eclipsed by that of other men vastly inferior, even from the military point of view, to him—Marlborough, for instance. He had no claim on mankind but that of a successful general—unless it be the doubtful one of successful rascality. Eugene stands high on the moral plane, as well as on every other. For a record of successful fighting and continuous service there would be difficulty in finding an analogy for his. From the age of twenty until he died, in 1736, he was almost constantly in the field—a period of fifty-three years. Other men have been longer with the colors; few ever fought so unintermittently. Europe's condition was in his epoch that of almost constant war (there were scarcely ten years of peace, as he remarked, since the treaty of Westphalia); and Eugène was always to be found wherever its flames mounted highest. Military men have studied, and with profit, the long story of his campaigns; readers of this will be interested more in the contemplation of the moral character of the brilliant commander. He himself furnished the means of making a true estimate of his character. His personal chronicle is a reflex of his thoughts as well as his deeds, his philosophy no less than his strategy. It is a study that affords no little satisfaction, so little is there of egotism about the writer, and so much that is sagacious and large-minded at the same time.

Personally the Prince was fond of war, as he assures us in his memoirs, yet politically he was opposed to it. Those who are on the side of war, he remarks, are those who take no part in it—the

ministers, the clergy, the women and the lawyers in the great cities. He told a brilliant company one day, as they were chattering and clamoring for a fresh war, that he wished the ministers and the ladies were each obliged to pay four thousand ducats to the Emperor, and each of the gentlemen to shoulder a musket and march to the front, that they might be enabled to feel what war really means.

François Eugène de Savoie-Carignan, the Prince's full designation, was a Frenchman whom some of his countrymen would style a renegade. The man who quits his country, like Coriolanus, with the avowed purpose of leading her enemies against it in war, fairly deserves such a description. Still, in his case there were extenuating circumstances. His father was Prince Eugène Maurice, Count of Soissons, and his mother Olympia Mancini, a niece of Cardinal Mazarin's. Young Eugène was by his parents intended for the Church, but he himself had no such high ambition; war was more to his liking. The King, Louis XIV., the Grand Monarque, the Roi Soliel, etc., was determined to force him into the Church, and he allowed the boy's mother, who was a prominent figure at his court, to suffer all sorts of petty persecutions at the hands of her enemies because she would not join the King in enforcing the wish. This persecution maddened the high-spirited lad, so that existence in France became intolerable to him. He quitted the country at the age of twenty, vowing that he never would return to it save as its enemy; and this resolve he fulfilled to the letter. These were certainly extenuating circumstances; yet not altogether sufficient to justify the extreme course of a man turning his sword against his own countrymen. Yet, on this point the Prince's own conscience seems to have been easy enough. Nowhere does he give vent to any sentiment of regret or compunction on the subject, but seemed rather to take a great pride in his repeated victories over the French generals.

The great Condé would appear to have been the military strategist whom Eugène took for ideal; and Eugène was the model whom the ill-fated young Bonaparte ("L'Aiglon") set before his mind's eye, while he was studying war at the Austrian court. His father took Frederick the Great as an example in many problems of the great art; and it is curious to note how the links of military renown bind age with age, as illustrated in the fact that it was the fortune of Eugène to have met with the Prussian maestro when he was as yet the Crown Prince, as well as his crotchety parent, the peppery mean old King. He expresses his contempt for the latter, because of his perpetual talk about drills and uniforms and pipeclay and buttons, as if these things were really the science of war; while

he has nothing but words of praise for the former because of his masterly knowledge of fortification and excellent judgment in choosing defensive positions.

The great aim of Eugène's life was to frustrate the designs of France against Austria and erect an insurmountable barrier between the two States, in the hostility of the people of those countries which form the respective frontiers. Austria was the country to which he offered his sword in his youth, and he served her with steadfast fidelity, through good and evil fortune, until he was no longer fit for campaigning work.

Eugène's first service was against the Turks. His bravery and skill were so conspicuous, even at the outset, that after the battle of Vienna, when the Moslem host was overthrown, he was given high command. Fourteen years later, after a prolonged compaign against the French in Savoy, he was again pitted against the Moslem. At Zenta he achieved the greatest victory over this common scourge that any European general had in a land campaign. He exterminated their army, in fact, and so compelled the peace of Carlowitz.

Eugène's third campaign was in the war of the Spanish succession. It was distinguished by some remarkable displays of military genius on his part. The daring commander anticipated Napoleon by taking his army over the Alps into Italy. There in the low country he encountered some of the most celebrated of the French generals—Catinat, Villeroi and Vendome. He defeated them all, but met a bad check at Cremona when endeavoring to capture that city by assault. It was defended by two divisions of the Irish Brigade in the service of the French King—those of Dillon and Burke. Although surprised in the night time, the men rushed from their beds to the square and flung themselves, half clad, upon the cavalry of the Prince and pulled the horsemen from their saddles to the ground. Their onslaught was so fierce and so unexpected that the assailants fled from the city in wild confusion. Soon afterward the sanguinary battle of Luzzara was fought between Eugène's army and that of Vendome, but resulting in no advantage to his side, though the French were no gainers either, he went to Southern Germany, where the combined forces of France and Bavaria were moving to attack those of the Emperor. In this campaign the Prince first met the Duke of Marlborough, and in coöperation they fought and won the famous battle of Blenheim. But he was not invariably victor, for in a short time afterwards he was defeated by Vendome at Cassano, being twice wounded himself in the course of the struggle. He was again wounded when he attacked the French before Turin, but he defeated

them, though with a much smaller army, and so raised the siege of the city. Later on he joined Marlborough again, the theatre of war being shifted to the Netherlands. Here their combined forces won the battles of Oudenarde and Malplaquet. Afterwards Eugène was entrusted with the siege of Lisle. It was a hotly contested undertaking throughout. In one of the assaults Eugène was terribly wounded. His troops thought him dead, and "so did I, too," he says naïvely in his mention of the incident. "They found a dung cart," he continued, with the same rough frankness, "in which I was conveyed to my quarters. First my life, then my sight, was despaired of. I recovered both. The ball had struck me obliquely. Here was another unsuccessful attack; out of 5,000 men not 1,500 returned, and 1,200 workmen were there killed"—a vivid picture of what war in the Low Countries meant under such hard-fighting commanders.

It seems never to have entered the Prince's mind to depreciate the skill or valor of the generals against whom he fought, or endeavor to exalt himself. He has nothing but praise for some of these commanders. The great Vendome always compels his admiration, as much for his astuteness in strategy as for his bravery in action. So does Luxembourg. Marshal Boufflers, who defended Lisle for several months against his forces, but was at length obliged to capitulate, is the object of many complimentary references in his memoirs. He, indeed, inspired Eugène with such respect that he allowed him to fix his own terms for making the surrender—a course of singular magnanimity. The noble pair met after the surrender, and each manifested in the most marked manner the esteem in which he held the other. The incidents of this memorable meeting form some of the most delightful portions of the Prince's memoirs, so ingenuous are the avowals and so hearty the expressions of good will by each of these eminent foemen.

During this remarkable siege the injustice of the sentence of death subsequently passed upon Admiral Byng, of the British navy, is strikingly forced upon the reader's attention. Prince Eugène mentions his services at Ostend, where he landed an English army of fourteen battalions and defeated a powerful French army, under Lamotte, which had been despatched to attack them on their landing. Admiral Byng, it will be remembered, was court-martialed on the charge of "cowardice," because he failed in his subsequent attack on the port of Minorca. What a disgraceful stigma on the British name! Because a commander fails to perform what has been assigned him, he must forsooth be branded as wanting in physical courage! Prince Eugène failed again and again, in various similar enterprises, and he never attempts to minimize or

excuse his failure. All he does is to show his losses and tell of the able conduct of his several adversaries in their resistance to his plans.

Marshal Catinat was one of the most formidable opponents with whom Eugène had to cross swords in early life. He also had crossed the Alps and descended on Piedmont; and on the field of Marsiglia he routed Eugène with heavy loss. For the first time the Irish soldier here had fair play for his valor and spirit of discipline. Catinat had some regiments of the Irish Brigade serving under him. Macaulay notes how these troops retrieved the misfortunes and misconduct of the war at home by the display of "a valor which distinguished them among many thousands of brave men."

The state of suspicion amid which even the most irreproachable commanders lived in those days of tortuous diplomacy and underhand intrigue may well be imagined from a passage in the Prince's memoirs wherein he describes his meeting with Marshal Boufflers after the latter had been forced to capitulate. "I durst not be alone a moment with the marshal," he writes, "lest idle stories should be circulated respecting us, and one or other might appear suspicious to our courts, where people are always sure to have good friends who are never asleep." The Duke of Marlborough was by no means so punctilious. He did not hesitate to intrigue against either his own country or his allies, whenever there was personal gain for himself or family in the transaction. In fact, there is no darker picture of a traitor to friend and foe alike than that which Macaulay draws of this remarkable combination of huckster and strategist—a man whose sense of honor stood in inverse ratio to his wonderful ability.

Although Eugène speaks in the highest terms of his great enemies —Boufflers, Villars, Vendome, D'Asfeld and others—he is not very enthusiatic about Marlborough, until the period came when the great general lost favor at court. Then his truly magnanimous character asserted itself. He hastened to London, with the view of doing all he could to restore his comrade in arms to his former eminence. The only fault he admits in his character is what he styles "his rather too great economy"—an excellent euphuism for a niggardliness unequaled in the records of the great. He himself had caught Marlborough, on the eve of the battle of Blenheim, standing on a chair snuffing out the candles which had given them light to draw the plans of the battle after they had dined.

Explaining his behavior toward the hero in disgrace, Prince Eugène puts the matter in a way that shows he was a good judge of average human nature. "From policy itself," he says, "persons of narrow minds ought to counterfeit feeling. Their designs are

too easily seen through. They are despised and miss their object." The people, he adds, liked him for standing up for an old comrade, and they followed him about London, manifesting their admiration; and the honest part of the court esteemed him the more for his fidelity. But Mrs. Marsham and the Whigs had completely triumphed. Marlborough's career was ended, as far as the court was concerned, and Eugène, after expending a good deal in making presents ("for buying," he remarks—that is, bribing—"is very common in England"), was obliged to depart from London completely unsuccessful in his chivalrous design.

When the Emperor Joseph I. died Prince Eugène again proved his integrity of character. "I sincerely regretted this prince," he writes, "the first who possessed genius since Charles V., and was not superstitious; and I determined to serve him even after his death. I hurried to almost all the electors to dispose them to insure the imperial crown to his brother, and then went to solicit the Dutch to continue their credit in money and friendship to Charles II. of Spain, who became the Emperor Charles VI."

Eugène was strongly indignant at the conduct of the Protestants of those days. They had put out shocking insinuations about the death of the Emperor Joseph, on the ground that he had given some offense to the Court of Rome. It is common, he says, to assert that great persons die of poison. No credit should be given to such defamatory libels. He was in a position to know how baseless they were, in that particular case as well as in many others.

Later on, when he was negotiating at Trieste for the establishment of a great trading company, he says: "I had to battle a good deal with the too-righteous Catholics and large wigs of this country. The Jesuits are indulgent, when you know how to manage them. They were very useful to me in procuring a cessation of the persecutions practised upon the Protestants in my fleet, who were forbidden the exercise of their religion."

Eugène, who was at this time an admiral, was a man of the most versatile genius and capability, as well as broad and liberal mind, as the foregoing observations prove. Though a staunch Catholic, he abhorred persecution in the name of religion, and he does good service in showing how false is the charge that the Jesuits preach or practice intolerance. He may be accepted as a reliable witness, since he was no less friendly with the Protestants of Europe of his time than with the Catholics of Austria and Spain. To the multiplicity of his employments he bears some amusing testimony. "After having been a soldier, minister, grand vizier, financier, postilion, negotiator, I was at last made a merchant. I established the Ostend Company. . . . I converted Trieste into a port

capable of containing two squadrons of men-of-war, to escort and protect the merchant vessels. I directed other small ports, or at least shelters, to be formed in the Gulf of Venice, the advantages of which were acknowledged by the whole monarchy." He omitted from his list of official appointments one of the most important—viz., that of Vicar General of Italy. This honor was conferred on him by the Emperor as a reward for the two terrible defeats he had inflicted on the Turks, at Peterwardein (August, 1716) and Belgrade a year later, breaking their power completely on the Austrian frontier. He had also filled the important post of Governor of the Netherlands.

Despite the fact that he had long ago turned away from France in bitterness and disgust, Prince Eugène never lost his admiration for that country's greatness. Under Louis XIV. she was at her zenith. Her generals, her statesmen, her philosophers, her men of letters and learning, formed at that time a galaxy of brilliant minds never previously equaled; and the prosperity of the country, in spite of its years of continuous warfare, was wonderfully high. After the capitulation of Friburg to the French general, De Villars, in 1711, the Prince breaks out into a threnody on the inferiority of the German Empire to the French monarchy. "There are very bad Germans in Germany," he complains. If they had only raised a hundred thousand men to help him check the French on the Rhine, he could have relieved the beleaguered cities. So now he counsels the Emperor to make peace, as the course of prudence. "France has been making prodigious efforts. Her resources are infinite. 'Tis the will of one individual and one nation. The Austrian monarchy" (*i. e.*, the German then) "is composed of five or six, which have different constitutions. What a difference in civilization, in population and importance! The title of Emperor does not bring in a single man or a single kreutzer. He must even negotiate with his empire, that it may not be French; with the Bohemians, that they may not run away into Prussia and Saxony, for fear of becoming soldiers; with his Lombards, who are ready to turn Savoyards; with his Hungarians, ready to turn Turks; and with his Flemings, ready to become Dutchmen."

This doleful rhapsody was the prelude to the peace of Rastadt (1714). The Prince and General de Villars were the two men who arranged it. It was then that the Prince was made Vicar General of Italy, with a salary of 150,000 florins.

Soon afterward the Grand Monarque had to yield to a greater, King Death, and Eugène expresses his feelings in a manner creditable in the highest to one who had always fought against the King as his personal enemy. The news produced the same effect upon

him as that of an old majestic oak uprooted and overthrown by a hurricane—he had been standing so long. Then he proceeds to moralize upon the lessons of great Kings' beginnings and endings, in a tone not usual in the military memoirists.

Leisure was now his for some time, and he proceeded to indulge his finer tastes. He built a palace, in the Turkish or Arabic style, in the suburbs of Vienna. He chose this peculiar style because of the fact that the spot where it stood was that whereon the Turkish grand vizier had pitched his tent at the siege of the city in 1529. His choice of architecture excited adverse criticism from the dilettanti, but he says he informed these superior critics that he was as well acquainted with the five orders of architecture as they, "as also with the seven orders of battle of Vegetius." "I like to have an order of my own in both sciences," he added, "and I have invented one." In battle certainly his invention usually asserted its own excellence. He says he put up fountains, cascades, *jets d'eau*, and superb basins in his palace grounds; and the superintending the erection of these, as well as the arrangement of his maps and choice books brought from London, in French, Latin and Italian, seems to have afforded him much delight. The Turkish Emperor sent him a rich present of Arabian horses, a scymetar and a turban, with the elegant compliment: "The one is a symbol of thy valor; the other of thy genius and wisdom." "I like this Eastern compliment," he jots down, "and I distrust those of Christians." The prevailing fashion in compliment, led by France, was then so artificial that it was little wonder a blunt soldier turned away from it in disdain.

This keen observer's criticisms on rulers and men by whom they were surrounded, brief and pithy though they be, are at times wonderfully suggestive of the Sultan's insight as to his mental attributes. The Emperor, Charles VI., had been brought up at the Spanish court, where etiquette was always of the stiffest and intercourse between monarch and counsellors formal to the point of frigidity. On the marriage of his niece the Emperor gave magnificent entertainments, at which the Prince figured. He gave entertainments, too, but there was little stiffness at these, for it was chiefly old comrades who met, and the rule with these war-scarred veterans was doubtless *desipere in loco*. He says nothing about ladies at his receptions; and he himself being a bachelor all his life, it is difficult to say whether his captains' captains—*i. e.*, their good wives—were there or not. He expresses his dislike of the gorgeous displays of robes made at the court pageants, and says he always wore his uniform and that some of the other generals followed his example.

Amid all these festivities the Prince did not lose sight of the more serious things of life. Naturally his position made him at times as much of a diplomatist as a fighter. He had a far greater knowledge of men, owing to the extent of his travels, the many varieties of minds with which he came into contact, and his keenness of insight, than those regularly brought up in the routine of government. He received much company at his house, he writes, in the interval between dinner and the play, "because I find that more business can be done in a drawing room than in a closet. I walked about with some foreign ministers or sat down in a corner with one of our own people; and a communicative air makes others talkative. On the other hand, I often see the reserve of others repel everybody; and concealing their mediocrity these gentlemen know no one; they are unacquainted with public and private opinion. 'Tis thus that sovereigns are often deceived, for want of mixing with society."

Another proof of his skill in psychology: "Charles had a reserved, Spanish air, and took but little pains to laugh—though he was fond of buffoons. This is always the case with people who are not naturally cheerful." This unfavorable picture he qualifies with the afterthought: "He was good and just."

The Emperor had two brothers whom the Prince seems to have esteemed more highly. They were Leopold and Joseph. The former, he thought, had more understanding than the Emperor; and the latter more than either, and he had the advantage of being much more amiable. Eugène, anticipating that Joseph one day might ascend the throne, bestowed much attention on his preparation for the duties of government—for Joseph, he says, would undertake that responsibility himself instead of playing the *roi faineant*. The advice he gave him presents a mixture of lofty ethics and practical statecraft which proves that power, no matter how well intentioned, can hardly ever dissociate itself from the principles of Machiavelli, identifying the good of the ruler with the good of the State and sacrificing morality to a real or fancied necessity of public well-being. "Employ, sire," he advised him, "none but honest men; but if you sometimes find a scoundrel willing to undertake the dirty work of intrigues and not ashamed to have his conduct disavowed, make use of such a one, without esteeming him. The honor of States is not so ticklish as that of individuals. Bad faith and meanness, independently of the abhorrence which they excite, are not sound policy; but address and dissimulation are allowable. . . . Never threaten any power until you are prepared to strike."

The principles of political economy and social science were not

highly developed in Eugène's day, yet he was vastly ahead of his age. He was constantly busy in the planning of improvements and the inculcation of practical ideas in the minds of the administrative chiefs. He asked the ministers, one time, he says: "Cannot you disband the host of underlings who prevent the money from reaching the pocket of the sovereign? Contrive a tax, proportionate to the income or earnings of each individual; provide habitations for paupers, and set them to work; consult the English, the Dutch, the bankers for a good system of finance and manufactures; invite Flemings, to improve our agriculture; bring our heaths into cultivation, by means of the monks and soldiers; join the rivers by canals; cause the roads to be repaired by the proprietors of the adjoining lands, without ruining the government by constructing them; encourage the breeding of horses, that money may not be carried out of the country." Many other sound maxims in politics and economy are scattered throughout the memoirs.

Eugène seems to have been always a busy man. His life was a continual scene of activity. When not engaged in war he was employed looking after his gardens, of which he appeared to be very fond, the decoration of his palace, the selection of pictures and statuary, the regulation of his library. He gave employment to fifteen hundred workmen on his grounds and in the palace. He seems to have found considerable time, with all his activities, to indulge his literary tastes. And (will it be believed of a soldier?) his favorite books were devotional and homiletic. He was fond of reading the sermons of Bossuet, of Bourdaloue, of Masillon; and he gives us his impressions of the respective merits of these great orators. "When Bourdaloue," he says, "inspires me with terror, Masillon fills me with hope. We were born in the same year, and I knew him on his entrance into the world—a perfectly amiable man. Bossuet astonishes, Fénélon affects me. I saw them also in my youth, and Marlborough and I paid the latter all possible honors when we took Cambrai." He wrote thus when he was seventy-two, adding that he had enemies in the country, jealous of his success and his reputation, but he forgave them, he said, with all his heart.

Eugène was fond also of music and the theatre. He liked a fine opera, he said, and a great tragedy, such as "Athalie," "Esther" and "Polyeucte."

It is not often that we find great captains religious. Eugène was certainly so—after his own fashion. "I have been happy in this life," he wrote, "and I wish to be so in the next. There are old dragoons who will pray for me. . . . The fine music, whether simple or more obstreperous, of the divine service delights

me. The one has something religious, which awes the soul; the other reminds, by the flourishes of trumpets and kettledrums, which have so often led my soldiers to victory, of the God of hosts who has blessed our arms. I have scarcely had time to sin, but I have set a bad example, perhaps, without knowing it, by my negligence of the forms of religion, in which I have, however, invariably believed. I have been too careless as a soldier and lived like a philosopher. I wish to die as a Christian."

Prince Eugène had less time for marrying than he had for sinning, it appears, since he always shunned the matrimonial state. He was exceedingly fond of his mother, and he seems to have had a great friendship for Madame de Bathiany, a lady high in court and diplomatic society. "I play picquet there every night," he says, and, in fact, he played that game there the very evening before he died. "I am fond of the company of young people; they are more pure, not having been corrupted by intrigue." These he used to meet at Madame de Bathiany's, who was at that time a widow, it seems. She must have been a lady of splendid qualities, and seems to have inspired him with something more than mere friendship. But he was then too old to entertain any romantic feeling. Still, they both must have often joked over the idea. He said to her one day, he writes: "If you were not religious and I were five-and-twenty, what would be the consequence?" "Nothing," she replied; "things would be just as they are. I am religious, in the first place, because I love God, and because I believe and put my trust in Him; in the next place, because this is the safeguard of my peace, which comes to the aid of my wounded self-love, if I were to be forsaken; and then, that I may be able to scoff at women who have lovers. I am religious because I have neither fear, nor hope, nor desire in this life; and because the good which I do for the poor, for humanity, is of benefit to my soul. I am religious because the wicked fear me and are disgusting to me. I am religious that I may not have occasion to be continually watchful of my reputation; women who are dare not say or do anything. But I detest those who assume the mask of piety or are religious only on account of the immortality of the soul. Were mine to perish with me, I would nevertheless endeavor to be virtuous as I do at present. It is not so much for fear of God as out of gratitude for His favors and love to Him that I am religious without publicly proclaiming it like those ladies who make a trade of the thing to please the court, rather than to please heaven." There were reports that Madame and the Prince were married, and one of her young friends mentioned the fact to Madame. But she only laughed and said: "I love him much too well for that. I would rather have a bad reputation than take away

his." By this she meant, no doubt, his reputation for good sense; since the world would be inclined to laugh at the spectacle of a man of seventy-two marrying a lady who might have been, perhaps, his granddaughter, or at least his daughter.

In these jottings Eugène gives us the picture of a very sweet and noble woman. Minds like hers exert a powerful influence upon all around them. Eugène felt the effects of her piety to the very day of his death. It acted like a talisman to shield him from temptation and the folly that often accompanies old age. He was in the company of this admirable woman, and heard her good counsel, down to the very last; and with such hopeful augury did the great captain lay down his arms to the King of Kings.

Behind Eugène's bier walked an Emperor and sixteen marshals of the army—the largest assemblage of military notables that ever followed the coffin of a comrade in arms. If the honor was unique, so was the hero to whom it was paid—great in war, great in peace, great in personal character and refined tastes. He was the foremost Catholic soldier of his time, or perhaps of any time, and one whose career and philosophy are well worth the attention of the student.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

THE APOSTLE OF JAPAN.

EUROPE owes to the Venetian, Marco Polo, the discovery of Japan, and Japan owes to Spain its Apostle, St. Francis Xavier, the great Jesuit missioner.[1] It was during his travels in China, from which he returned in 1295, that Marco Polo heard of the existence of the island of Chipangu, by which name Japan was then known to the Chinese, of its civilized but idolatrous people and of the endless quantity of gold the group of islands in the high seas, 1,500 miles from the Asiatic Continent, possessed. Recent history has made known what a large share the discovery of gold mines has in the making (or perhaps marring) of empires; and Europeans in the thirteenth and subsequent centuries were as liable to the gold fever, the *auri sacra fames*, as their descendants in the nineteenth. In the wake of the Venetians followed the Portuguese.

Japan was in a state of anarchy when, in 1542, the Portuguese made their first appearance there, three fugitives from a Portuguese vessel in a Chinese junk having been driven on the shores of one

[1] Urban VIII. gave him the title of Apostle of the Indies and Pius IX. that of Apostle of Japan.

of the southern islands. Three years later the well-known traveler, Fernan Mendez Pinto, visited Japan, to which he returned in 1547 and rescued two Japanese fugitives, who were taken in the Portuguese vessel to Malacca, where Pinto met St. Francis Xavier, who had just arrived upon his mission to the far East. The saint took the fugitives to Goa, where they were converted and baptized. One, Anger or Anjiro, as he is called by the early Jesuits, received the name of Paulo de Santa Fé, or Paul of the Holy Faith, and his companion that of John. They learned to speak and write Portuguese and were the saint's first co-workers in the attempted Christianization of Japan.

The four large islands and three thousand smaller ones which form the Empire of Japan, called by the Japanese themselves Dai (Great) Nippon,[2] are situated in the northwestern part of the Pacific Ocean. They are a portion of the long line of volcanic islands extending from Kamtschatka on the north to Formosa on the south. The principal island, Hondo, which runs nearly north and south a distance of about 590 miles and extends east and west for about 540 miles, was the fabulously rich island, whose wealth exceeded the dreams of avarice, which Columbus hoped to reach by circumnavigating the globe. Measured by its greatest extension, it is about 1,130 miles long, although its greatest width does not exceed 200 miles, and for much of its length it is not more than 100 miles across the island. The second largest island, Yezo, is 350 miles long by 270 broad; the third, Kyushu, extends for about 200 miles from north to south; and the fourth, Shikoku, is about half as large as the last named. There are only a few large cities. Tokyo, the capital, situated on the main island, has a population of 1,155,200; Osaka, the second largest city, 473,541; Kyoto, the old capital, 289,588; Nogoya, 170,433; Kobé, 136,968, and Yokohama, 127,987. Besides these there are four cities whose population ranges from 60,000 to 100,000; twelve from 40,000 to 60,000, and twelve from 30,000 to 40,000. According to the census of 1890, the total population of the empire was 40,453,461.

Two distinct races are represented in the population, the Ainos, presumably a remnant of the aborigines and a rapidly diminishing quantity, and the Japanese, a branch of the great Mongolian race. The former, descendants of the Yemishi, hardy barbarians from the north and east, brought under subjection by the Japanese, are a hairy race, noted now for their peaceful and inoffensive character and primitive habits, although they long resisted the military power of the latter.

[2] Nippon, or Niphon, signifies in Japanese the East, or origin of the sun. From the Chinese name Gepuanque, or Chipangu, Europeans have evolved the word Japan.

The primitive religion of the Japanese was Shintoism, which prevailed long before Buddhism was introduced by priests from Korea. It was a singular creed, with no dogmas and no moral code, its adherents asserting that "morals" were invented by the Chinese because they were an immoral people, and that in Japan there was no necessity for any system of morals, as every Japanese acted rightly if he only consulted his own heart.

"From the beginning of their history," says a contemporary writer,[3] "they have been a receptive people. They have stood ready to welcome the good things which were offered to them, coming from whatever direction. They accepted eagerly the Chinese written language and the philosophy with which it came charged. They accepted Buddhism with its priesthood, dogma and ritual, and permitted it to crowd their native religion until it became a pitiful minority. They have in recent times accepted with a hearty impetuosity the civilization of Western nations, and are absorbing it as rapidly as the habits and thoughts of a people can take in so important a change.

We have the testimony of St. Francis Xavier himself that the Japanese were very eager to learn what they did not know both in things divine and things natural. The saint undertook the voyage to Japan, as he tells St. Ignatius,[4] with great happiness in his soul and with still greater hope, because he felt quite confident that the labor they might spend on that nation would produce solid and lasting fruit. "In the college at Goa, which is called the College of Santa Fé," he says, "we have three Japanese students who came thither with me last year from Malacca. They tell us wonderful things about Japan. They are youths of very good virtue and very sharp wit; Paul in particular, who is sending you a letter of very good length. In the space of eight months he has learned perfectly to read, write and speak Portuguese. He is now making the exercises, and with very good fruit. He is quite well instructed in the Christian doctrine. I have really a very good hope that by God's help there will be a large number made Christians in Japan." These hopes were not deceived, for by 1582 the Jesuits made as many as 600,000 native converts, justifying the forecast of the apostle who had been told by the Portuguese merchant who brought the Japanese Anger to him that the compatriots of the latter surpassed other people in their desire for knowledge. "If the rest of the Japanese," the saint wrote to Rome, "have the same ardor for gaining knowledge that Anger has, then they surpass in genius all nations anywhere found. In truth, he has a great thirst for knowl-

[3] "Japan." By David Murray, Ph. D., LL. D., late adviser to the Japanese Minister of Education.

[4] Letter 63. Coleridge's edition.

edge—a thing which avails very much for a quick perception of truth." This desire of knowing was, and is still, common to his countrymen, who, the Japanese neophyte assured the saint, would be sure to ask him a great number of questions about the religion he was introducing and would, above all, consider whether his actions agreed with his words; for it was a nation which followed the guidance of reason.

This Anger, or Han-Siro as he was probably called in Japan, is an illustration of the aphorism that out of evil cometh good. In the heat of passion he had committed homicide in his own country and was pursued either by the officers of justice or by the relatives of the man he had slain. He took refuge in a monastery of bonzes, expecting to find there not only protection from his pursuers, but peace for his remorseful conscience. He found safety for a time, but was not secure against punishment; and his own conscience gave him no rest. His acquaintance with some Portuguese merchants led him to open his heart to one of them, Alfonso Vaz, who urged him to escape in one of the Portuguese ships to India, where he would find persons who would assist him to set his soul in order and regain his peace of conscience. He gave him a letter to another merchant, Ferdinand Alvarez, but the Japanese delivered it by mistake to a different person of the same name, who took him to Malacca, telling him a great deal on the voyage about his friend, Francis Xavier. Anger was extremely anxious to see Francis, whom he already looked upon as a man sent from heaven to heal the wounds of his soul; but when he arrived at Malacca Francis had not returned from the Moluccas, and after waiting for some time the Japanese gave up his intention of applying to him and started on his voyage homewards. He was within sight of Japan when a tempest drove his ship back, and he was forced to land on the coast of China, and when he sailed again from China towards Japan another storm forced him to put back into the port from whence he had started. Here he met again Alfonso Vaz, who persuaded him to return to Malacca, and on his landing there the first person he fell in with was his old friend, Alvarez, who took him at once to Francis, who had arrived in the meantime from Amboyna. Thus this sinner, through his conversion, was the obscure instrument which, in the wonderful workings of God's Providence, led to the attempted Christianization of Japan, culminating in the fulness of time in the addition of a glorious phalanx of saints to the white-robed army of martyrs canonized under the Pontificate of Pius IX.

The account of Japan given by the Japanese Brother Paul of the Holy Faith is still extant, as it was preserved both at Rome and Coimbra. In the letter to St. Ignatius the Japanese convert gives

a short history of his adventures and his conversion. Another long and interesting document about Japan, together with the statements of Portuguese merchants, must, Father Coleridge concludes, have formed the foundation of all the knowledge possessed by St. Francis Xavier concerning it until he landed there with Father Cosmo Torres, Paul and two other Japanese, "persuaded," as he says, "that the Christian religion will be propagated in those parts far and wide." His plan was, as soon as he arrived in Japan, to go to the King himself and the principal seats of learning, and when he had made himself well acquainted with all these matters, to write of what he had found out, not only to India, but to the universities of Portugal, Italy and, above all, Paris, and admonish them, while they are devoting themselves heart and soul to learned studies, not to think themselves so free and disengaged from responsibility as to take no trouble at all about the ignorance of the heathen and the loss of their immortal souls.

The letters written by St. Francis Xavier after his return to Malacca from the Moluccas, in 1547, show how firm a hold the idea of an expedition to Japan had taken on his mind, almost from the first moment when he had met the Japanese Anger and his Portuguese friends. "His," comments Father Coleridge, "was the heart and soul of an apostle; and as St. Paul longed for Rome, or Spain, or even still more distant countries, while he was yet in Asia Minor, or Greece, or his prison at Cæsarea, so the tidings that told Francis of new islands where the Gospel had never been preached seemed almost to put upon his conscience the duty of devoting himself to the work of carrying among them the name of Jesus Christ. . . . The expedition to Japan, which presented itself to his mind with so many attractive features to recommend it, was an enterprise which Francis might have concluded to undertake on grounds of simple reason. The Japanese were intelligent, noble, manly, liberal, anxious to learn and ready to be convinced of the truth. The field was open and free from many of the obstacles which were felt so fatally in India and elsewhere." But it was neither the reasonableness nor attractiveness of the enterprise, viewed from a human standpoint, which decided the saint, but the light and guidance of the Holy Spirit which he sought and obtained in prayer and meditation, following out that golden maxim of St. Ignatius—pray, believing that everything depends upon God; act as if everything depended upon yourself—a maxim which crystallizes and condenses in one sentence heavenly and human wisdom.

He was enabled to enter Japan with devoted friends and disciples at his side, to whom the customs and language of the country were perfectly familiar.

Having arranged the affairs of the society in India, which he was to leave for an almost indefinite period, he sailed from Cochin along with his five companions—two Jesuits and three Japanese Christians —for Malacca, which they reached on May 31, 1549, after a voyage of forty days, and from which he wrote to the King of Portugal: "I feel the most intimate certainty and conviction in my mind that it is expedient for the service of God that I should go to Japan. This has given me a ready and vigorous confidence, and I have put an end to all delay in the matter by sailing from India, that I may follow the undoubted call of God, who urges me on to this voyage by frequent and strong interior impulses." His Japanese converts also felt urged to join in this voyage by a great desire of leading their own people to the religion of Christ. They reëmbarked at Malacca in a Chinese junk, the captain of which was a heathen named Ladro, who was bound by contract, pledging his wife and whole household property as security for its fulfillment to take them straight to Japan, returning with letters in their handwriting as vouchers; otherwise all that he possessed at Malacca would be confiscated to the Crown. Many Portuguese merchants had offered their vessels for this purpose, feeling that the presence of an apostle on board any ship would secure her safety from the great dangers of all kinds by which the voyage to Japan was beset; but for one reason or another every Christian ship was at that moment unavailable, some not being ready for sea, repairs being wanting to one, another not having completed her cargo, and another not being yet manned. Paul of the Holy Faith shrewdly as well as piously observed that all this happened by a singular providence of God, for if the Japanese had seen on the one hand St. Francis preaching the holy law of God, and at the same time and place had also seen, on the other, the Christian merchants doing things contrary to the same law, they would have formed their judgment of it rather from the deeds of the merchants than from the words of the preacher, and would have told the saint how could it be that the Christians looked forward to the good things of heaven after death if they lived as if there were no goods but those of this world? He thanked God that no European entered Japan along with St. Francis Xavier.

The Apostle's hopes of achieving a great conquest of souls rose higher and higher with every news that reached him from that country. While still at Malacca he wrote, on June 20, 1549, to Father Joam Beira: "It is said that some of the great people of Japan are thinking of sending an embassy to the King of Portugal to ask him to send them some priests who may preach to them the law of Christ. We all go in very high spirits and confidence, hoping that some remarkable fruit will come from our voyage, the

almighty power of our Lord God helping in His mercy our weak efforts. I am now pretty well aware how much good can be done in these parts; and if, when I reach those islands at the end of the world, I come to think clearly that more return for our labors may be justly expected there, I mean to call you all to join me, and transplant you to work in places where a larger harvest may be reaped. So you must prepare your hearts and work up your zeal even now, that nothing may prevent you from obeying me without delay as soon as you receive my letters calling you away to Japan." In one of the numerous letters he wrote at Malacca before his departure mention is made of the desire of one of the Japanese princes to become a Christian and of his sending an envoy to the Governor of the Indies to obtain Catholic teachers.

Once St. Francis had clearly recognized in himself, that is interiorly, the intimation and conviction that it was God's will he should go to Japan, he gave himself up to the plan so entirely and irrevocably that it seemed to him that if he were to desist from what he had begun he should be more wicked and detestable than the very idolaters of Japan. He was further confirmed in his purpose because he saw the enemy of the human race setting a great many devices in motion in order to make him give up the thought of it. He declares his intention of taking possession of the country "in the name of Christ our King," and as soon as he disembarked going to the King of Japan and delivering the message he had for him "from the Supreme Emperor of all nations, our Lord Jesus Christ." He had been told that the King had always with him a large band of men of letters, full of confidence in their own genius, learning and eloquence. "I do not fear much, relying on God, from the opposition of all their learning," writes the saint; "for what good learning can people have who do not know Jesus Christ? . . . It is a great comfort to us to know that God, who judges the inmost feelings of the human heart, sees clearly with what wish, with what aim, with what prayer and in search of what it is that we are moved to undertake this voyage to Japan. Our own conscience tells us that in that expedition we seek and desire nothing else at all save only that we may lead the souls of men, created in the image of God, to the knowledge of their Creator, that the Supreme Author of all things may be praised as He deserves by the creatures whom He has made in His own likeness, and the frontiers of the empire of our holy mother Church, the Spouse of Christ, may be advanced and her realm enlarged. And so we go, glowing with vigorous confidence, and we venture to presume and reckon on as a thing certain and as if our hope had received a pledge of its fulfillment, that this voyage of ours to Japan will unfailingly issue in

happy and joyful success." He knew that it was a dangerous voyage which was before them, it being common knowledge at the time that out of all the ships which sailed from India to Japan one in every three was lost by one of three causes of destruction—storms, rocks or shoals and pirates.

Mendez Pinto, who was at Malacca at the time, relates how he embarked about sunset on the feast of St. John Baptist in a small junk belonging to a Chinese Corsair called Necoda,[5] and the next morning set sail, the winds being very favorable. Contrary to his agreement, the captain changed his course, loitering about the intervening islands and, against the will of the missioners and despite their efforts, joining with his crew in worshiping an idol on the poop and consulting the devil from time to time whether it would be advantageous or not to sail to Japan. When they had sailed three hundred miles, the saint records, they put into a certain island and made ready their rigging and equipment for the very severe storms which sweep the Chinese sea. Thereupon the sailors offered many superstitious sacrifices to the idol and again cast lots to ascertain from the imaginary oracle whether they should have good winds. The response to their thinking being satisfactory they heaved anchor and pursued their course, again interrupted by asking the idol whether the ship would return safely to Malacca; the lots declaring, as it were, that she would reach Japan, but would not return to Malacca, they made up their mind to give up the voyage till next year and winter in China. On one occasion Emmanuel, the Chinese, one of St. Francis' companions, was near being killed by falling head foremost during a storm from a great height into the vessel's sink or tank, and on another the captain's daughter was cast overboard into the sea, sinking close to the ship in the sight of her father. After calling at Canton and having abandoned the idea of touching at Tchin-tcheon, because they were told the harbor was infested by pirates, they finally reached Cagoxima, in Japan, on the feast of the Assumption, 1549. It was the native place of Paul of the Holy Faith, by whose relatives and the rest of the people they were kindly received. This port lies on an arm of the sea which deeply indents the coast of the southern and most westerly islands.

[5] This Corsair died at Cagoxima. "He did his work for us, on the whole, as we wished, throughout the voyage," St. Francis wrote to Don Pedro de Silva, commandant at Malacca, "and yet we were not able to repay him by good offices when we came to port or when he died. He himself chose to die in his own superstitions; he did not even leave to us the power of rewarding him by that kindness which we can after their death do to other friends who die in the profession of the Christian faith, in commending their souls to God, since the poor fellow by his own hand cast his soul into hell, where there is no redemption."

The Apostle prepared for the beginning of his apostolate among the Japanese by practising great humility, praying day and night, offering up continual austerities and acquiring an elementary knowledge of the language, so as to be able to translate the commandments and the creed into Japanese and give a short explanation of both. On the feast of St. Michael he visited the Prince of Satsouma, who received him honorably (having been previously visited by Paul of the Holy Faith, who presented him with a picture of the Madonna and Child, which the prince venerated, kneeling before it), and a few days later gave him permission to preach the Christian law, which he allowed any of his subjects to embrace if they chose.

Speaking of the Japanese generally, the saint wrote: "The nation with which we have to do here surpasses in goodness any of the nations lately discovered. I really think that among barbarous nations there can be none that has more natural goodness than the Japanese. They are of a kindly disposition, not at all given to cheating, wonderfully desirous of honor and rank. Honor with them is placed above everything else. There are a great many poor among them, but poverty is not a disgrace to any one. . . . They are wonderfully inclined to all that is good and honest, and have an extreme eagerness to learn." They marveled that the Jesuits should have come the whole way from Portugal to Japan, a voyage of more than 6,000 leagues, for no other purpose than to treat with them about divine things, to set forth the Christian faith and show them in their errors the way of eternal salvation. They listened with great avidity to religious discourses, and the saint exhorts his brethren at Goa to rejoice and give thanks to God that new regions were thus laid open in which their own industry might some day find a large field for exertion. The first fruits were gathered by the saint's companion, the Japanese convert Paul, who converted his wife and daughter as well as many kinsmen and intimate friends.

Japan at this time possessed numerous seats of learning where the bonzes or Buddhist priests, notwithstanding their immorality, cultivated literature. What St. Francis calls Meaco, the largest city in Japan, said to contain 90,000 houses, all timber built, and the residence of royalty, was a city of "bonzeries" or academies, presided over by bonzes of various sects. The saint makes mention of a famous university there as well as five colleges and more than two hundred monasteries of bonzes, besides five other principal academies round Meaco, each frequented by about 3,500 scholars. The largest and most noted of the academies was at Bandou, in the north of the large island of Nippon. The saint writes of interesting the European universities and the Pope in this field already white

with a harvest ready to be gathered and garnered and inviting "all the pious religious orders so dear to God who are burning with the desire of extending the Christian kingdom, to come out at once and slake that heavenly thirst for souls which they feel in these islands of Japan." He was in great hopes if God only gave him ten years more of life of seeing many great results produced both by those who accompanied and those who would follow him. That year two bonzes, who had been educated in the universities of Meaco and Bandou, and several other Japanese were going to India to learn the mysteries of the Christian religion.

By a letter dated November 11, 1549, he commands three of the Indian Jesuits, Gaspar Baertz, Balthasar Gago and Diego Carvalhez, whom he knew to be "animated by burning desires to promote the glory of God," to go to the city of Meaco, where he hoped to meet them. In a subsequent letter he announced that two Japanese bonzes, who had given up their sacrilegious priesthood and been converted, would arrive at the college at Goa that year, with the admonition: "Take care to treat them courteously and kindly, just as I used to treat Paul of the Holy Faith, the Japanese, when I was with you. The character of the Japanese is such that nothing in the world can bend or guide them except kindness and benevolence."

While always keeping in view the higher aims and objects of the great spiritual work in which he was engaged, the saint, with that practicality which has ever distinguished the Jesuits, did not disdain or disregard making use of human methods to subserve superhuman or divine ends. Being anxious to secure a ready means of conveyance for the successive bands of missioners, he employed as an expedient a list of the articles of merchandise for which a good market could be readily found in Japan in order to stimulate the enterprise of the Portuguese Governor, revenue officials and merchants and secure the despatch of a government ship every year from Goa to Osaka, the port of Meaco, the Venice of Japan; or the equipping of a ship by some one to whom the Governor might give the commission of opening up the Japanese trade, with a monopoly of the market. In a letter to Don Pedro de Silva, commandant of Malacca, he wrote: "Unless I am mistaken, this expedition of ours to Japan promises to produce rich results to the King and his realm." He points out how storehouses might be built at Osaka, a maritime city, the chief centre of Japanese trade, where European merchandise might be stored until exchanged for the precious metals of Japan, silver and gold, besides its manufactures and produce, and that he would try to persuade the King of Japan to send an ambassador to India with a view to a commercial treaty for the mutual benefit of both nations. Passing from the temporal to the spiritual, he ex-

presses great confidence in our Lord that before two years are over they shall have at Meaco a church dedicated to Our Lady, so that thenceforth those who sail to Japan may be able, in the terrible storms of the Chinese archipelago, to invoke the Blessed Madonna of Meaco. He begs for something to divide among the poor Christians in Japan and tells him that many Japanese were on their way to him, attracted to India by what they had heard Paul relate of the wonders of the power and virtue of the Portuguese, adding that much will be done towards drawing them on towards embracing the Christian religion if they find by their own experience that Paul's account of the Portuguese is true.

The arrival of this letter, together with that of the Japanese recommended by it to the good offices of the Capitan of Malacca, was made the occasion of public demonstrations of joy. Don Pedro had the royal standard hoisted on the fortress, the guns fired a salute and a grand procession was organized to go to the Church of Our Lady del Monte to give thanks for the good news which seemed to promise the conversion of Japan. Magistrates and soldiers joined the Vicar General and clergy in this procession. The streets were hung with colors and lighted up at night. The Vicar sang High Mass in presence of all the authorities. Soon after this the Japanese strangers were baptized, Don Pedro de Silva himself standing as their godfather.[6]

Meanwhile St. Francis, who had freely availed of the prince's permission to publicly preach the Gospel, had many friendly interviews with the chief priest of the bonzes, head of one of the Buddhist monasteries in the neighborhood. Miracles were not wanting to confirm the truth of his preaching. The most remarkable was wrought in favor of the only daughter of a nobleman whom, in his agony of bereavement after her death, the new converts urged to recommend his case to the God of the Christians, and to have recourse to the prayers of the great teacher of the Portuguese. The father threw himself at the Apostle's feet; but sorrow choked his utterance, and he could say nothing. The saint withdrew for a few moments with Joam Fernandez into the little oratory in which he usually said Mass, and after a short, fervent prayer returned to the afflicted father and told him to go, that his prayers were heard. He said nothing more, and the nobleman felt grieved and hurt. In this state of mind he went homewards, and was met first by a servant, who told him that his daughter was alive, and then by the girl herself, who ran to him and threw herself on his neck. She said that as soon as she had breathed her last two horrible demons had seized her and were about to cast her into hell, when

[6] Father Coleridge.

two men of venerable aspect came and rescued her, and the next moment she found herself safe and well. The father took her to the house where St. Francis Xavier and Fernandez were staying, and as soon as she saw them she cried out that they were the two who had delivered her. Both father and daughter were at once instructed and baptized. Another miracle conveyed a stern rebuke to those who reject or revile the ministers of God. A Japanese had beeen insulting and jeering at St. Francis, who turned to him and said gently: "God preserve your mouth, friend!" The man was struck at once with a horrible and noisome cancerous disease in his mouth. These and other miracles served to increase the credit of the missioners, and it seemed likely that large numbers would become Christians.[7]

But an impediment arose which retarded if it did not put a stop to the work of evangelization. The bonzes, two of whom had already become converts, felt as a body that their vested interests were involved in the preaching of the missioners, whose doctrine and example were in such reproachful contrast to theirs. They took alarm and went to the prince, threatening him all sorts of calamities if he permitted the worship of the ancient gods of their country to fall into disrepute and disuse. Their protest, coinciding with the abandonment by the Portuguese of Cagoxima as a mart in favor of Firando, about fifty or sixty miles north of Nagasaki, the Prince of Satsouma was so incensed at what he considered ingratitude that he withdrew his permission to teach the Christian religion and forbade any one, under pain of death, to become a Christian. This edict, although it does not appear to have been followed by any active measures of persecution, changed the attitude of the local population. St. Francis confined himself for several months to instructing the neophytes who chiefly comprised the family and friends of Paul of the Holy Faith, who assembled privately, like the early Christians, for prayer and worship, translating into the Japanese language a summary of the Christian doctrine and of the life of Our Lord. This *pusillus grex* was thus silently laying the foundation of that Church of Japan which has added to the annals of the Church in the far East a record of heroic constancy and fortitude only to be paralleled by the heroism of the first Christians during the persecutions under Nero and Diocletian.

Meanwhile miracles were multiplied and served both to confirm in the faith the converts, who were singularly devoted to their new religion and its teachers, and to draw others into the fold of the only Church which possesses this mark of apostolicity. One of the

[7] Father Coleridge.

miracles strikingly recalls the story of the miraculous draught related in the Gospels. The saint was walking one day by the seashore where some fishermen were dragging their nets, which, to their great affliction, were empty. St. Francis blessed the nets with the sign of the Cross, and bade them cast them again into the sea. This time the nets were found full to abundance, and that part of the sea remained afterwards remarkably productive. At another time a town visited by a severe pestilence was delivered from the plague by his prayers, while many of its inhabitants were simultaneously delivered from the worse plague of paganism and converted to Christianity. He also cured a deformed child, taking him up into his arms, healed a leper, gave sight to a blind man by making the sign of the Cross over him and wrought several other miracles.

At the beginning of September, 1550, St. Francis went to Firando, leaving Paul of the Holy Faith[8] in charge of the Christians of Cagoxima. The saint traveled on foot, carrying a little bundle containing all that was necessary for the celebration of Mass and accompanied by the two Europeans, Cosmo Torres and Joam Fernandez, a convert named Bernard, the first fruits of his preaching at Cagoxima, and another Japanese. He had not gone many miles on his road when he was invited by one of the great lords of the country, whose name is given as Ekandono or Eshandono, to visit him in one of the great castles. Ekandono had heard wonders of the "bonze" from the West who had been teaching a new religion at Cagoxima, and was eager to see and hear him. The Apostle preached with such earnestness and power that he was able to baptize seventeen converts before he left the castle, including the lady of the house and her eldest son. Francis left Ekandono, who was dubious and hesitant, a copy of the Japanese translation of the Christian doctrine, and carefully regulated the pious exercises and rule of life of the little community, found many years afterwards (in 1562) in a state of fervor when Father Luis d'Almeyda visited the castle during a visitation of the Christians in Firando, Cagoxima and Boungo and was eagerly questioned by the lady of the manor and fourteen others whom the saint had baptized "for news of Father Francis and of the progress of Christianity in other parts of Japan, rejoicing much in the good tidings which he gave them, for it was many years since they had seen a Father or Brother of the Society." An old man held in much esteem, a kind of majordomo, whom all loved greatly on account of his virtue, and the lady herself

[8] He was obliged to go into exile through the persecutions of the bonzes some months after St. Francis Xavier took leave of him, found his way to China and was murdered by robbers near Liampou.

related many miracles which God had wrought since the saint had departed, leaving them some prayers and litanies written by his own hand, which the lady preserved as relics, applying them to sick persons whom they healed. One of these invalids was Ekandono himself, whose life had at one time been in danger, and who had been at once cured. These Christians met once a week to take the discipline in common with a discipline which the Apostle had left behind; but the old man considered it so precious that he would not let any one give himself more than three strokes with it, lest it should be worn out.[9] Ekandono was only prevented from becoming a Christian through fear of the prince.

Mossei, quoted by Father Coleridge, mentions a still more striking instance of the long time during which the memory of St. Francis Xavier's preaching was kept up without the presence of missioners in the case of a place called Canadabè, thirteen leagues from Cagoxima, where fifty-five years after his visit a number of Christians were found, among whom was the daughter of the chief nobleman, who was baptized when a little girl by St. Francis, and had since consecrated herself to God by a vow of chastity.

St. Francis was received at Firando with a salvo of artillery by the captain of a Portuguese trading ship, and he was conducted with all honor to the prince, who gave him leave to preach freely. In a few days more conversions were made than during a whole year at Cagoxima.

Leaving Cosmo Torres at Firando and taking with him Joam Fernandez and his two Japanese converts, the saint, pursuing his journey to Meaco, embarked for Facata, a port on the southern and smaller of the great islands, and from thence sailed again to Simonoseki, the port of Amanguchi, the capital of a considerable State on the larger island of Nippon. The deplorable immorality of Amanguchi moved the ardent zeal of St. Francis Xavier, whose preaching in the streets and public places led to his being invited to come and explain his doctrine in private houses. This he did with the courage, fearlessness and freedom of a true Apostle. Joam Fernandez related afterwards how Francis, usually so humble and meek in demeanor, confronted the pride and arrogance of the rich and noble Japanese who used to interrogate him, bearing himself in a most lofty and dignified manner. At times Joam himself had to answer them in the same bold, uncompromising manner, and he confessed that while he did so he sometimes expected to see the sword of the questioner flash from the scabbard

[9] Almeyda baptized some children, two of whom were lads, sons of Ekandono, whom he found perfectly prepared for baptism by the instructions of the old man, whom on returning a week or two after, he found just dead.

to make the heads of both Francis and himself roll in the dust. Although his intrepid demeanor conquered the respect of some, the bonzes insulted and the common people, doubtless instigated by them, turned him into ridicule, abused him and ran after him, pelting him with stones and filth. The prince sent for him and after listening to a long exposition of Christian doctrine, in the course of which the saint reproached him with his own and his nobles' vices, he let him go in peace. After several weeks' preaching, which resulted in very few conversions, he left the city in the begnning of December, 1550, for Meaco, where, failing to obtain audience of the Mikado or Cubosamo, the spiritual and temporal heads of the empire, he preached in the streets, but the people were too much preoccupied with the civil war then being waged to pay much heed to him.

The saint suffered much in this apostolate. His life was in danger; he was assailed by crowds and more than once was wounded by arrows and almost stoned to death. In a letter to Goa the saint describes how, whenever they went through the streets of Amanguchi—a city of 10,000 households—they were followed by a small crowd of boys of the lowest dregs of the populace laughing at and mocking them and making a joke and play of the articles of the Christian religion. On the other hand, many of those who listened with avidity to the life of Our Lord as he preached in the streets and at the cross-roads were unable to restrain their tears when he came to relate the Passion. Nevertheless very few became Christians. He was two months on the road between that city and the capital, braving the cold and running the risk of falling into the hands of robbers who infested it.

On leaving Meaco, formerly a very large city containing at one time 180,000 dwellings, he made a change of front in his method of pursuing his apostolate and opened a new campaign of preaching on a second visit to Amanguchi, where, instead of appearing as a poor missioner, he boldly demanded audience of the Prince or King of Naugato as an envoy of the King of Portugal, with his companions as attendants and provided with letters and presents from the Governor of the Indies, the Bishop of Goa and the commandant of Malacca, originally intended for the Mikado. He was well received and the next day the city was placarded with an edict authorizing the preaching of the Christian religion, while an empty bonzery or Buddhist monastery was assigned to the new teachers as a residence. The authorization, St. Francis relates, was granted "with the greatest good-will," the saint having refused an offering of a large amount of gold and silver from the prince. The edict allowed any one who wished to become a Christian. A great

many consequently went to the Jesuit missioners, who preached twice a day and held discussions at which many of the bonzes, nobility and citizens were present. The first to become Christians were those who had been their most strenuous adversaries in controversy. "Many of these were persons of good birth," says the saint, "and when they had embraced Christianity they became our friends with an amount of warmth which I can find no words to describe. . . . In the space of two months quite as many as 500 have become Christians. Their number is being daily added to. . . . It is quite incredible how much the Christians love us. They are always coming to our house to ask whether we have anything at all which we wish them to do for us. All the Japanese appear naturally very obliging; certainly the Christians among them are so very good to us that it would be impossible to exceed their extreme kindness and attentiveness."

The Japanese, though infanticide (pre-natal and post-natal), suicide and unnatural vices prevailed in every class of society, were of a remarkably intelligent and inquiring turn of mind and had a special passion for theological disputations. Their vices were rather the outcome of ignorance than of natural perversity and were not regarded as crimes by the false religion taught by the bonzes, which was split up into nine different sects.[10] Contemporary Europe has nothing to boast of in contrast to them as regards sectional differences, for there are about fifty different sects in England alone. Before the apostolate of St. Francis Xavier the Japanese were perpetually disputing among themselves, but after his preaching they all began to contend about the Christian faith. "It is really very wonderful," he writes, "that in so large a city as Amanguchi in every house and in every place men should be talking constantly about the law of God. But if I were to go into the history of all their questionings, I should have to write on forever." They left him hardly time to read his Office or take food or rest, they came in such throngs to the monastery in which the Jesuits were lodged.

Miracles again attested the truth of the doctrine he taught, of which the mortified lives of the Jesuits was a living exposition. The Pentecostal gift of tongues[11] was in a measure renewed, so

[10] Kaempfer, in 1691, reckoned in Meaco 3,893 tira, or temples of new or strange divinities; 2,117 mia, or temples of the original ancient divinities of Japan, and 52.169 bonzes. The famous temple at Kioto contained 33,333 idols.

[11] This gift he exercised in two ways. First, he spoke the language (which he had never learnt) of nations to whom he went to preach the Gospel as freely and elegantly as if he had been born and educated in the midst of those nations; and in the second place, it not infrequently happened that men of different nations heard him at the same time, each in his own lan-

that in after years when other missioners succeeded St. Francis in Japan the people complained that they did not answer their questions as immediately as the first teacher of Christianity, who made one reply to several questions simultaneously put by different persons in the crowd. Other wonderful things, such as his healing many sick persons by the sign of the Cross or by holy water, are likewise recorded by the two Japanese converts of whom mention has been made.

After he had been two years in Japan, during which Christianity had made considerable progress, particularly at Amanguchi, despite the opposition and calumnies of the bonzes, who were fast losing their young disciples and were confuted, confounded and silenced by the Apostle's arguments, St. Francis thought of returning to India to select suitable subjects for the mission, the new field of spiritual conquests which his active and enterprising zeal had opened up. Although he was very cautious in admitting converts until they had been well instructed and proved, the Christians in Amanguchi at this time numbered three thousand. He was laying deeply and solidly the foundations of a Church in the far East; and mindful that "unless the Lord build the house they labor in vain who build," he based it upon a strong, supernaturalized faith which he inculcated by word and example. The result was that neither the secret persecution of Oxindono, who, fearing to alienate the Portuguese merchants by openly revoking his edict of toleration, confiscated the property of the converts, nor the calumnies of the bonzes made these pioneer Christians of Japan waver. They stood firm, and St. Francis Xavier bore witness that there was not one of them who was not ready to lose everything he possessed, even life itself, for the sake of the faith. This spirit of martyrdom, says Father Coleridge,[12] was characteristic of the Japanese Christians from the very beginning; and it testifies to the thorough instruction given to them by the missioners, as well as to the influence of the apostolic sanctity and greatness of soul which were conspicuous in their first great teacher.

Leaving Amanguchi in the autumn of 1551, St. Francis set out for Figi, the port of Fucheo, capital of the Kingdom of Boungo, which lies on the northeastern coast of the large island of Ximo or Kiou Siou, part of the Japanese group in which Satsouma and its chief city, Cagoxima, are situate. The King, who sent word of

guage. This happened at Amanguchi and elsewhere, particularly in the port of Jafanapatain, and was considered as a great miracle, which made people venerate him, and also converted many. Fourteen witnesses testified to it. (*Relatio super sancitate et miraculis Francisci Xaverii*, quoted by Father Coleridge. "Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier, vol. II., p. 383.)

12 Op. cit.

the arrival of a Portuguese ship, begged him to visit him. The saint, who was accompanied by three Japanese Christians, one of whom was a young doctor named Laurence,[13] previously sent for Father Cosmo Torres to join Joam Fernandez and take charge of the Christians at Amanguchi. After walking to within a few miles of Figi, he fell ill; his feet were swollen and he had a violent headache. The Portuguese, apprised of his approach, rode out to meet him, leading a horse for him to mount. "We met him," relates Mendez Pinto, "coming in the company of two Christians, whom within a month he had converted to the faith, men of the highest quality in the kingdom. As we were all in our holiday dress and mounted on good horses, we were quite struck with confusion to meet him in so sorry a plight; for, besides that he was on foot, he carried on his shoulders a bundle in which were all the things necessary for saying Mass. Because he would never accept any of our horses, we were obliged to accompany him on foot, although it was against his will; and this served for a great example to the two new converts."

The saint, who was very popular among merchants and sailors, was received at Figi with a great *fanfare* and several salvos of artillery, to the astonishment of the King and citizens, who thought they were returning the fire of some squadrons of Corsairs off the coast. But when the King heard that it was rejoicing at the arrival of Father Francis, a holy man whom the King of Portugal held in high esteem, he sent a young noble of his own family in a state barge with a letter to the "father bonze of Chimahicogim"—the Japanese name for Portugal—begging him to come and see him. The Portuguese insisted on being allowed to escort St. Francis with every mark of honor and were met by great crowds of people. By the express order of the King a litter was provided for him, but he would not use it and walked to the palace, accompanied by a number of nobles and thirty Portuguese, with a retinue of servants gaily attired and having gold chains around their necks. St. Francis was clad in a cassock of black camlet, over which was a surplice and a stole of green velvet brocaded with gold. In his suite walked the captain, baton in hand, as majordomo, followed by five of the richest merchants, each carrying ceremoniously something appertaining to the saint, whose passage in processional order

[13] A young doctor of great reputation for learning, who was about to join the bonzes when he was converted by the meekness of the Jesuit missioner, Joam Fernandez, who, when a man approached him one day as he was preaching as if to whisper something into his ear, and then spat in his face, gently wiped away the spittle with his handkerchief and went on with his sermon. The doctor was baptized by St. Francis, taking the name of Laurence, and soon afterwards was received into the society. His name became famous in the annals of the infant Church of Japan.—Father Coleridge.

through the nine principal streets of the city was witnessed by a vast crowd, every place to the roofs of the houses being full of people. At the palace, where he was received by a hundred men in armor, the merchants made a great impression on the court by each kneeling before the saint and presenting him with the article he carried, the Japanese nobles regarding with admiration the dignity and majesty of the person to whom such homage was paid. After a pretty incident, a little prepared speech of welcome by a child between six and seven years of age, led by an old man, the Apostle was greeted by the lords of the kingdom, who bent their heads thrice to the ground, the King himself advancing five or six steps to meet him and pay him the same compliment, an elaborate form of salutation called the *gromenare*. The King received him with the utmost respect, made him sit by his side and ordered out of the apartment a bonze who protested. After this interview with Civan, King of Boungo, of whom mention is frequently made in the early annals of the Church of Japan, St. Francis made numerous converts, including a learned bonze of Canafama, who, after a long disputation, made a public profession of faith in Christianity in presence of a large assemblage.

After several prolonged controversial discussions with the bonzes, who when they failed in argument had recourse to calumny and stimulating revolts, St. Francis set sail for India on November 20, 1551, along with two Japanese Christians, Bernard and Matthias, and an envoy from the King of Boungo to the Governor of the Indies, asking for the Portuguese alliance and for Jesuit Fathers to teach Christianity to his people. Reaching Cochin on the 24th of January, 1552, he addressed a long letter to the society in Europe on the 29th, reviewing the main incidents of his mission to Japan, to which in the April following some Fathers were sent from India. "Later on, if God wills," he adds, "fresh members of the society will be sent to Japan every year, and a house of the society will be established at Amanguchi, where the Fathers will learn the language of the country and acquaint themselves with the doctrines and rules of the different sects. By these means the good and learned members of the society who are to come hither from Portugal to aid the University of Bandou will find Brothers there acquainted with the language and the religions of Japan." The system of sects then prevailing in Japan having been derived from China, St. Francis Xavier was in hopes that if the Chinese accepted the Christian faith, the Japanese would give up the doctrines which the Chinese had taught them. During their two and a half years' sojourn in Japan St. Francis and his companions

lived at the expense of the King of Portugal, who ordered more than a thousand gold crowns to be given to them as alms for their journey. "It is incredible," says the grateful Apostle, "how much this excellent monarch has favored us, and how much he has spent and daily continues to spend on our colleges and residences and for the supply of all our necessities." In a letter to St. Ignatius he lays great stress on the importance of sending persons of great excellence and eminent both for virtue and learning to the Japanese universities, men endowed with "strength of soul and patience, and indeed all virtues in perfection, to tear to pieces the sophistries of the bonzes, confound their falsehoods and expose the unworthy and secret artifices with which they suck the purses of the credulous people." The number of these bonzes and bonzesses was immense and almost incredible; one dominion was said to count 800 convents, containing at least thirty persons in each, while an infinite number contained four, six or eight. There were nine rules for both men and women, all differing in their laws and precepts, each one being free to apply himself to that which he liked best. Some of the sects had three hundred, others five hundred precepts, but all agreed on five principal and essential ones which it was indispensable to keep. These were: First, not to kill nor to eat anything that had been killed; second, not to steal; third, not to commit adultery; fourth, not to lie; fifth, to abstain from wine. The bonzes traded on the credulity of the people, persuading them that it was impossible for persons in general to keep these five commandments, but that they would observe them for them and make satisfaction for all the evil they did on condition of the people giving them convents, yearly revenues and money for all necessary uses—in short, paying them every kind of honor and homage. The rich, who were able to donate liberally to these impostors, felt at liberty to indulge their passions to any extent, while the poor were held by the bonzes to have no chance of escaping condemnation!

St. Francis knew that the mad fury of these false priests would break out when their ridiculous pretensions were exposed and their chief source of gain ceased to exist; and in his letter to St. Ignatius at Rome he speaks of "conflicts and trials beyond all common expectation" and "a violent tempest of ill will" which the Fathers who are to follow will have to endure, and how self-evident it is that what is wanted are "powerful intellects, practised in dialectics, gifted with a popular eloquence, quick to follow error in its shiftings and even to anticipate them; able to snatch the mask from lies which plausibly bear the semblance of reality, to unravel sophistical arguments and to show the incoherence and mutual contradiction of false doctrines." Old men he declares to be un-

suited for the work; neither are young men desirable "except those in whom the defect of age is supplied by great virtues, proved clearly by severe trials," as "all kinds of temptations and occasions of sin abound in Japan." He thought Belgians or Germans, acquainted with Portuguese or Spanish, would be well fitted, but that all missioners for Japan should be first sent to St. Ignatius at Rome. He perceived in the Japanese "a happy disposition for approving the Christian religion when sufficiently explained to them, and for persevering with constancy therein when they have received it, as well as handing it on to their posterity," and thought "even the greatest labor would be well employed in cultivating them." He regarded the Japanese nation as superior to any other in the East and did not think there was any other in which the Christian religion would take root and remain firm and lasting. "As far as I know," adds the saint, "the Japanese nation is the single and only nation of them all which seems likely to preserve unshaken and forever the profession of Christian holiness if once it embraces it; but this will doubtless not be without great sufferings and heroic conflicts on the part of the preachers of the Gospel." Prophetic words, as the sequel proved!

R. F. O'Connor.

Clontarf, Dublin.

THE TOTAL SUPPRESSION OF THE FRENCH CONGREGATIONS.

THE ALLEGED REASONS.

RESIDING in one of the Channel Islands, whence the coast of France can be sighted and where French priests and nuns who have taken refuge in British territory may occasionally be seen, one cannot but turn one's thoughts to the tragedy which has just been enacted in France—the expulsion of the religious orders, and finally in March last the vote of the Deputies in favor of the complete suppression of all the congregations engaged in teaching. Truly, these are sweeping measures; but may not their very magnitude give us pause and make us shrewdly suspect that there must have been very good reasons for such draconism? Falstaff refused to give a reason on compulsion; M. Combes has often been asked for his reasons; but though his

reasons ought to be as plentiful as blackberries, we are no better off than if he, too, had refused to give reasons on compulsion. It cannot, of course, be denied that he has very good reasons of his own, or at least one good reason—his hatred of the Church—but in the columns of the *Journal Officiel* of the Chamber of Deputies you may search in vain for an argument proving the necessity of this wholesale destruction. It is quite true that we meet with catch-words, party cries, magnificent phrasing full of sound and fury. The teaching given by the congregations "distorts the brain, perpetuates superstition, organizes a fetichism which must at all costs be rooted out from the soil of France. The members of the congregations have made a renunciation of the plenitude of their individuality. We must do away with the legal existence of an organism which is no longer in touch with the needs, the rights and the normal conditions of modern education." These are only a few specimens of the verbiage which passes for argument. Nor can we blame the orators from whose speeches these extracts are taken for the method they have adopted. There is a principle, well known nowadays, which states that if you cannot find a workable argument, the best thing you can do is to repeat your proposition often and emphatically; and your hearers as well as yourself will eventually come to accept the statement, just as George IV. came to believe his story about Waterloo. This is known as "proof by the method of assertion." Long words, vague and somewhat unintelligible language are useful; for modern audiences are exactly the same as those Athenian audiences mentioned by Aristophanes and Thucydides as being "ready to gape in wonderment in front of any casual speaker," and "slaves to the delight of hearing."

M. Combes' one reason for his vandalism is, as already stated, his hatred of the Church; but as this cannot be used as an argument, he must perforce vary his language. We shall see that all his arguments have their origin in this hatred, and that at the end of all his speeches we must imagine we hear a "delenda est Carthago," though instead of Carthage we must put Carthage's old-time foe.

It will not be labor lost to call the attention of Catholics outside France to the real motives of this war against the congregations. The present writer has heard English Catholics (they were not all laymen) give their opinion to the effect that the congregations for their meddlesome interference in politics richly deserved what they got. The fact of the matter is that anti-clericals in France have not yet discovered a single concrete fact to prove their charges. But stay! there is one fact which has done solitary and yeoman service for four years. At the time of the Paris Exhibition a synopsis of history was found in an exercise book which belonged to a pupil

of a congregationist school. It was therein stated that Protestantism had done much harm in France and that the Revolution was a calamitous event. To judge from the uproar caused by this discovery, one would think that this exercise book was a real danger to the Republic, and called for the suppression of all congregationist schools. In the words of M. Buisson, it was the duty of the government to rescue children from such pernicious doctrines.

The bill for the total suppression of teaching congregations was discussed this year during February and March, and M. Combes' reasons for this final act of destruction are to be found in the speech he delivered in the Chamber of Deputies on March 7. His first argument is a little surprising, but none the less refreshing to Catholics, who are ever having it dinned into their ears that they are retrograde; that, far from moving in the same line of progress as the rest of the world, they are hostile to all progress. The congregations, he says, must not be allowed to teach because they show a progressive spirit. The teaching given by them in the early days of their foundation was very different from their programmes of the present day. They have made a visible effort to adapt themselves to their new surroundings and to the methods of instruction which prevail in modern society. "Take one of these congregations which has been spoken of in nearly all our sittings, that of the Frères des Ecoles chrétiennes. Authorized according to the law of 1808 to teach the three R's, it represented primary education in its most rudimentary state. As time went on, this congregation developed in the people the taste for and the need of education, enlarged its syllabus, made efforts to perfect its teaching and entered into competition with rival establishments of the same order. The further it advanced along this way, the further it departed from its primitive plan and from its statutes. It seems that a spirit of progress took hold of it and carried it along." Here the speaker was interrupted by a Deputy who asked: "What is there to complain of in that? You ought to consider it a point in their favor." M. Combes continued: "But, alas! it was only so in appearance; for though progress may have shown itself on the exterior, it had no influence on the moral side, which remains to-day that which it ever was, an immutable doctrine blindly subjected to the dogma of faith. Thus, whatever pains the congregations may have taken to follow the science of pedagogy in its evolution and to harmonize its syllabus with university regulations and social careers, there exists an irreconcilable opposition between the moral tendency of its lessons and the spirit of modern society." The last sentence was interrupted by M. Paul Lerolle, who reminded the speaker that in many points the congregation had not followed but

led the way in the evolution of pedagogy.[1] It is hardly necessary to insist on the inconsistency of M. Combes' argument. We gather from his words two useful facts: first, that the congregations kept in touch with the "spirit of modern society," and, secondly, that any one who submits to the dogma of faith, or holds opinions contrary to those of Ministerialists is not only outside the pale of true Republicanism, but a traitor to the Republic. This intolerant attitude is continually manifesting itself. One example of recent occurrence will suffice. The chair of French literature at the Collège de France having become vacant by the death of Emile Deschanel, two candidates came forward, M. Lefranc and M. Brunetière. The world-wide reputation of the latter was looked upon as a certain pledge of his election; but the electors, deferring to the emphatically expressed wishes of the Radical press, refused to vote for a Catholic. The protests of the French Academy and of the *Temps*, and the discussion which followed thereon, only served to show more clearly that M. Brunetière had been made to suffer for his religious opinions.

In the next part of M. Combes' speech, which treats of the financial difficulties involved in the suppression of the teaching congregations, there seems to be a break in the argumentation; but if we read on far enough we shall see that there is complete continuity. Remember that all his arguments can be reduced to his theories against the Church, *e. g.*, that she is out of touch with modern society, hostile to progress, destructive of the liberties of man, opposed to the Republic and to the principles of the Revolution, etc.

The financial aspect may well engage the serious attention of the government. The opposition have made good capital out of it; and in the present troubled state of Europe, when war is in the air, and in view of the enormous expenditure required for the maintenance of the army, in view also of the revelations made by the enquiry into the state of the navy, any further expenditure of public money must be shown to be absolutely necessary. The opposition had made calculations for the purpose of ascertaining the expense that would be incurred by the State in replacing the Frères by lay teachers. M. Combes endeavors to show that these estimates are erroneous, and bases his argument on the report of M. Buisson, who was commissioned to study the question. The jugglery of figures need not trouble us here, especially as a large number of Deputies do not accept M. Buisson's report as trust-

[1] On March 1 M. Paul Lerolle made an eloquent speech in defense of the teaching congregations. His valuable historical account of their work shows that they were true pioneers in education and generally moved in advance of their rivals.

worthy. What is important to notice is that the objection put by M. Aynard to the President of the Council on February 29 has not yet received an answer. The objection runs as follows: "Voici la question que j'ai l'honneur d'adresser à M. le Président du Conseil: Le projet du gouvernement entend remplacer 9,000 à 10,000 Frères qui enseignent 200,000 enfants, par 2,400 professeurs laïques. 9,000 à 10,000 Frères enseignant 200,000 enfants, cela fait 20 à 25 élèves par Frère instituteur." First of all, then, the government will have to pay salaries to at least 2,400 extra teachers; and, secondly, the number 2,400 is absurdly short of what is required. The Brothers have twenty to twenty-five pupils in each class; and this is generally admitted to be the maximum number that can be kept in order and taught at the same time by one schoolmaster. Now if we distribute the 200,000 children among the 2,400 teachers, who according to the plan of the French Government are to replace the Brothers, each of these new teachers will have eighty pupils in his class. To this difficulty M. Chaumié, the Minister of Public Instruction, endeavored to supply an answer. He gave two solutions and called special attention to the second one as being in his opinion the more conclusive. Here then is a literal translation of the great solution: "It often happens that opposite a Brothers' school having a considerable number of pupils we find a public school where the number of pupils is very low. Let us suppose a class taught by the Brothers which has thirty pupils—I take hypothetical numbers for the sake of an example—and, on the other side of the road, a class taught by a public teacher which contains only ten pupils; the thirty will be able to pass into the class of the public teacher without topping the normal number. On the one side we shall have done away with a school kept by a Brother, and on the other side it will not be necessary to appoint an extra public teacher." The problem of how one man can teach eighty pupils still remains unsolved; and we learn incidentally on M. Chaumieé's confession that the Brothers' schools were more popular than State schools; but more about this popularity later on.

We return to M. Combes' speech. After some show of careful manipulation of figures, he admits that the State will have to face during five years an annual expenditure of 3,700,000 francs, and the communes a corresponding expenditure of 4,650,000 francs. But M. Combes is anxious to get out of his embarrassing position. He briefly reminds his hearers that the budget is prepared to meet an annual expenditure of ten millions, and then proceeds to cut the Gordian knot with a bludgeon. Turning to his supporters, he addresses to them this stirring bit of rhetoric: "I ask the Republican majority of this assembly if such expenditure can outweigh the

realization of the democratic and social progress which will result from the new law."

The pendulum always comes to rest in the same position. The mention of democratic and social progress reminds M. Combes of the fact that persons who have bound themselves by vows in a congregation can have no part in this progress. And why? Because they have cut themselves off from mankind; they have renounced the full plenitude of their faculties; they perpetuate superstition and fanaticism; their religion is mere fetichism.[2] In the speech which is occupying us at present, the speaker argues that by taking the three vows a man destroys his liberty, and liberty being necessary for the citizen, he also destroys his citizenship; now, "to teach children to be citizens and citizens of a free country, one must be a citizen and free." M. Combes does not tell us if he took his text from the famous line of Brooke's "Gustavus Vasa:"

> Who rules o'er freedmen should himself be free;

he certainly deserves to have the still more famous parody flung at him:

> Who drives fat oven should himself be fat.

It is not difficult to discover the reason why the three vows are so distasteful to these Freemasons. It is because the vows represent the highest perfection in the Church. But apart from the reason of hatred of the Church, it is not easy to see why the vows should come in for so much obloquy; and M. Combes ought to be the last person in the world to indulge in tilts against them.

Take, for instance, the vow of poverty. Men who of their own free will have given up all they possessed in the world in order to give themselves more completely to the service of others can hardly be called anti-social. Had there not been men in the world who set no store on money, it would have gone hard with M. Combes' education, as he himself has admitted. True, it is not often he

[2] These amiable remarks are taken from various speeches of Ministerialists. The following passage occurs in a speech delivered by M. Buisson on March 18, 1903: "By taking vows a member of a congregation passes out of society. In vain does he show himself at given moments; in vain does he mix with the world from time to time; in vain does he gather round his rostrum at certain hours a number of children. His whole moral being is out of harmony with his exterior being. Henceforward his world is the convent. The children, whom it is his duty to instruct, are instructed by him in a way contrary to the ideas which are current in their world, and conformably to the ideas of his own world. All his teaching tends to detach them from the moral doctrines which prevail in the society of which they are members." And yet, in spite of all this, M. Combes and his friends have on many occasions complained of the number of distinguished men, officers, lawyers, doctors, etc., who have received their education in Jesuit colleges.

deigns to give us a little autobiography; he has no need to do so, for the opposition lose very few opportunities of reminding him of his past history. We make no apology then for quoting the following: "I owe nothing to the congregation. I was never its pupil. Born in a poor family, I had to get an education where I could get it cheapest. I made my studies in an institution which was petit séminaire and college combined, séminaire for the sons of poor parents, college for the sons of the upper classes."[3] It is quite true that the petit séminaire did not belong to a congregation, but that does not contradict our statement that M. Combes would not be in his present position had he not been able to find men who were not troubled with the *auri sacra fames.*

The vow of chastity is a delicate question, and perhaps there is here no common ground for discussion. It may or may not be that the destroyers of the congregations hold the angelic virtue in esteem, or think it altogether necessary for each man to put some curb on his passions for the dignity of his home and of his life. Of a truth, the *aimables plaisanteries* indulged in by a good number of Deputies would seem to indicate that to be asked to have some regard for this virtue was, in their opinion, rather a good joke. If, however, they admit that chastity is a good thing, then they can find no fault with the vow; if they do not, then the congregations will be very pleased to be told that they are cut off from the "moral unity."

As to the vow of obedience, we cannot do better than listen to M. Denys Cochin turning the tables on M. Combes and Co. "Too many people in the times in which we live (and in all times) have to submit to the rule of obedience. Many of us here may not have felt the weight of obedience and discipline; but is not the spirit of obedience and discipline necessary in a crowd of professions? Can you deny it, you who in the host of functionaries we have in France make no distinction whatever between State officials and government officials, and demand from all the most absolute obedience? Formerly the vow of obedience was admitted in the case of immediate officials of the government—prefects, for example, and subprefects, who ought, as I think, to represent the spirit of the government; but the same vow was not required of engineers, officers, magistrates, who are the officials not of the government, but of the State. A short time ago a schoolmaster in a small town said to me: 'I am very fortunate in having an excellent inspector; he was kind enough to warn me of the danger which threatened me. "Take care," he said, "your wife goes too often to the church just opposite; tell her to go to the one a little further on."' You talk

[3] Speech in Ch. of Dep. March 18, 1903.

of people who impose on themselves the vow of obedience, and you impose on all who depend on you the most cruel and pitiless obedience. Not a day passes but you put them between their bread and their conscience; and what I say I could prove by a number of personal anecdotes. Would you like me to give you another? (Cries of "Parlez!") Last year I took a short trip in France. Instead of going far afield I stayed in our country, where there are so many good things to be admired. I was in a small town, and on the platform I tried to get some information from the station master. A few days afterwards I received a letter, in which the writer said: 'I saw you yesterday on the platform. I know you; I think a good deal of you, and I wanted to speak with you; you will understand why I could not do so. I am an official, and under the most absolute obedience—'."[4]

The above examination is, of course, not meant to be taken as a complete defense of religious vows, but only as a brief indication of the inconsistencies into which the enemies of the Church fall when they attack the vows. But what right has the French Government to take cognizance of vows, which are individual resolutions to be dealt with only by the interior forum? As M. Raiberti pointed out on March 7, the law cannot take cognizance of them, because the law deals only with exterior acts, and because its action ceases where conscience begins.

Occasionally the enemies of the congregations adopt a different attitude. While still retaining all their animosity against the vows, they profess to have a great sympathy for those who have had the misfortune to be inveigled into binding themselves by vow. "We attack the congregations," said M. Buisson on March 3, "because they constitute a vast system of oppression ever fatal to human liberty. It is precisely because I attribute this colossal force to the congregations that I feel great compassion for its victims. These men and women under the influence of religious excitation or great suffering or magnificent *dévouement* have allowed themselves to be captured by the congregations; once caught in the gear, enrolled in the service and worn down by skilful methods of trituration, they have no longer sufficient strength to free themselves." Accordingly the government formed itself into a humane society for the prevention of cruelty to misguided men and women and for the emancipation of slaves. But an act of liberation cannot be performed unless there is somebody to be liberated; and in this case the ungrateful slaves refused to be liberated. Further, to their state of willing slavery they added that of voluntary exile, and left their country to settle down in foreign lands, where they found that

[4] Speech in Ch. of Dep. March 3, 1904.

liberty which was denied to them by their fellow-countrymen. Many of these exiles have found a home in England, where the prayers and even the mere presence of so many devoted servants of God will bring a blessing on the land which is whitening to the harvest.

The rest of M. Combes' speech deals with "la liberté d'enseignement," that is, the right of individuals to open schools and the right of parents to choose what school they will send their children to. M. Combes is here on difficult ground. He must guard himself against the charge of contravening that all-sacred liberty which is, or ought to be, the glorious appanage of all French citizens. He also knows that the principles of the Revolution, which form the one standard for testing the rectitude of his own position and the perversity and immorality of Catholics, are against him here. The Declaration of the Rights of Man of 1791 contains the following article: "The free communication of ideas and opinions is one of the most precious rights of man. Every citizen then may freely speak, write and print, though he will be answerable for the abuse of this liberty in cases determined by the law." Then again, M. Combes has to explain away his own former pronouncements on educational liberty. On March 1 of this year M. Charles Benoist reminded the President of the Council of two remarkable statements made by him on the subject. The first was written by him in the days of the Empire, when M. Combes was still a journalist. "Pas de loie d'exception contre le prêtre, centre le Jésuite, le congréganiste; liberté pour tout le monde, pour le franc-maçon comme pour le Capucin, pour l'evêque comme pour le journaliste, pour les corporations réligieuses comme pour les chemins de fer—" The second pronouncement was made a few years ago as part of the evidence he gave before the commission presided over by M. Ribot. "Je suis fermement d'opinion qu'au-dessus de cette discussion si importante pour l'avenir des générations doit planer le principe de la liberté de l'enseignement." But circumstances have changed since these opinions were uttered. Universal liberty was necessary a few years ago; but now subterranean burrowings have brought M. Combes out on top. His position has put him in touch with the various members of the social body, and he is able to state the precise dose of liberty required for each member. "Educational liberty," he said on March 18, 1903, "may figure with honor in certain constitutions. But it is certain, it is proved historically, that other constitutions may be liberal, broad-minded, wholly free from the practice of dragooning subjects in regard to the actions of social life, and yet submit the exercise of educational liberty to restrictions, more or less rigorous, which exclude certain classes of men considered incapable or unworthy of being intrusted with this liberty."

In his speech of March 7, 1904, he tells us whom he considers incapable and unworthy. Educational liberty can only be claimed "by the citizen, by the man who is in integral possession of his rights, by the man who is fitted for the complete accomplishment of his duties." This kind of argument, however, satisfies neither the rest of the Deputies nor even M. Combes himself. Accordingly the ex-disciple of St. Thomas Aquinas[5] brings his philosophy to bear upon the subject, and denies the existence of such a thing as a natural right. Moreover, "I hold that this liberty is a pure delegation, a concession granted by the power of the State." His meaning is quite clear. Fathers and mothers have the right to instruct their children only in so far as this right has been granted to them by the State. He continues: "I also hold that this concession, not less than other concessions emanating from the State, is subordinate to the general interest of the State."

There we have the blunt avowal of the doctrine held by the men who at the present moment rule the destinies of France. It is not too much to say that such a doctrine, put into practice by unscrupulous politicians, is the open road which leads to the most intolerable of tyrannies; for there can be no greater tyranny than that which fetters mind and conscience. But, having said this much by way of animadversion, we leave the doctrine to speak for itself and propose to set in juxtaposition to it the Catholic doctrine on educational liberty.

There is a French proverb which forbids us to "prêcher un converti;" but every sermon is not necessarily addressed to unbelievers. There is no harm done if we Catholics occasionally call to memory doctrines of which we are already convinced, and strengthen at the same time the grounds of these convictions. Educational liberty is one of these doctrines; and we cannot insist too often on the necessity of this liberty, especially at the present time, when diplomas, certificates, school inspection and other comparatively harmless methods of State intervention tend to make us so accustomed to such things, that we may eventually forget that there is a limit to this interference, or remmeber the fact only when it is too late.

We hold that the family is the first of human societies; that it is constituted a society by natural right, having its origin in the very nature of man. Its end is the physical, intellectual and moral formation of the children. Everything proves it—the natural union of husband and wife, the inborn love of parents for those whom they have brought into the world, the instinctive desire to devote them-

[5] Many years ago M. Combes published a book entitled "La Psychologie de Saint Thomas d'Aquin." Needless to say, his philosophic opinions have since undergone a complete revolution.

selves to the bringing-up of their children. God has decreed that children shall be born in one way and not in another, and into that decree the State does not enter. Nothing could be more erroneous than the famous dictum of Danton: "Les enfants appartiennent à la République avant d'appartenir à leurs parents." Children at birth become members of a family; they become members of the State only mediately, that is, through the family.[6] It is impossible to become a member of a society antecedently to the existence of that society; and if you assert that families do not yet exist, you thereby deny the existence of the State. We think it hardly necessary to have recourse to the authority of Aristotle, St. Thomas, Leo XIII., in order to be convinced that the evolution of a State proceeds in the following order. First of all comes the family, then the sept or village or commune composed of a number of families, then the State—the outcome of a union of septs.

Fortunately we are still far from the state of things advocated by Plato in the Fifth Book of the Republic, wherein he would have children taken away from their mothers as soon as possible after birth and handed over to the care of public nurses, so that when grown up they might not know who their father or mother was, and thus be free to give their whole attention to the service of the State. But there is no reason why Danton or rather his modern followers should not proceed to this length. It follows logically from their tenets that the individual members of a family have as much connection with each other as a brood of chickens hatched by the same hen from a miscellaneous collection of eggs.

The family, then, is a natural society, possessed of natural rights and duties. Among these duties is the duty of furnishing their children with the necessary complement of the first gift of life, to wit, the training of mind and body. Flowing from this duty is the right of giving to their children that education which they, the sole judges in the matter, consider the most fitting and advantageous. They have then a right to all the means of education which society has at its disposal. None of these means can be imposed upon them, none can be denied them without violating their rights and the rights of the children; for it must not be forgotten that the latter also have rights. The State functionary, with his official *raideur*, is the last man in the world to be able or even to be willing to take into consideration all the varying circumstances which may influence a father in the choice of an education.

Now if parents can devote themselves to the adequate education

[6] Leo XII. Encycl. "Rerum Novarum:" "Filii sunt aliquid patris, et velut paternae amplificatio quaedam personae; proprieque loqui si volumus, non ipsi per se, sed per communitatem demesticam, in qua generati sunt, civilem ineunt et participant societatem."

of their children, well and good; if they cannot, their rights are not thereby cancelled. They may invoke the assistance of others to relieve them from the whole or a part of their task; and this they may do either by making a choice among the schools already existing, or by combining with other families in the erection of a school that will supply their wants.

It is clear then that the monopoly of schools, by which the civil authority reserves to itself the sole right of opening schools, violates the natural right inherent in the family. We do not say that the State may in no way busy itself with education; we say that the education of children is primarily the duty of parents. Secondarily and from purely accidental circumstances, the work may devolve upon the State; for example, if parents are found to be gravely neglectful of their duties, or if such poverty reigns in the district that it is impossible for the commune to erect schools or make other necessary provisions, then the State not only may, but must come to the rescue. But this is a very different thing from saying that the State is the sole arbiter in the matter of education, and possesses the right of founding its own schools and at the same time putting an interdict on all others.

The duty of a government is to help, not to hamper its subjects. The State is for the members, not the members for the State. Thus we take it as a well-founded principle that not only in matters educational, but also in commerce, in the management of industries, means of production, railways and the like, the first attitude of a government ought to be that of helping others to act rather than of acting itself. Supposing then that the State is ready to lend a helping hand in education, it can easily find legitimate means of doing so. It has been proved by experience that prudent grants of subsidies, pensions or prizes to schools where the teachers take their duties seriously, where system, order and diligence prevail, form a very efficacious stimulant and have greatly contributed to scientific, literary and artistic progress. Again, if the State thinks it can help to secure greater efficiency by requiring schoolmasters to be provided with some sort of diploma or by instituting compulsory registration of teachers, we have not much to complain of. Only it must be remarked that the value of such safeguards is grossly exaggerated in some quarters. A diploma or a degree may very well indicate that the holder is possessed of a certain amount of knowledge, but it does not prove that he is thereby able to "sell his merchandise," as the French say. Still, whenever such regulations have been passed by public authority, Catholics have not been conspicuous in the ranks of the recalcitrants. In France, for example, Catholic schools have always submitted to these ordinances.

They have at once undertaken to see that their teachers are provided with the necessary brevets. They have never tried to evade school inspection, but have rather provoked it. They have worked in open daylight, in such contrast to their enemies, the Freemasons.

In whatever way help is given, care must be taken that it does not become the thin end of the wedge opening the way to the complete intrusion of the State into the school. The State has its own well-defined functions, and if it claims among those functions the right of forming the public mind and thus procuring that union of thought and sentiment without which citizens could not tend with unanimity to the realization of aims common to the whole community, it must carry out the work by the use of those powers only which public authority may rightly exercise. All will go well if the government aims at passing wise laws, at an enlightened administration, at an honest and straightforward policy. Things will go awry if Ministers think that by the mere fact of being politicians they are also educators. You may twist and turn the various powers of the State, the legislative power, the judicial power, the executive power, but you will never produce therefrom the educative power. Besides, it stands to reason that men whose whole life has been spent in practical acquaintance with schools and with the problems and difficulties of teaching are more qualified to deal with the subject than Ministers whose knowledge is but second-hand theory.

The *mainmise* of the French Government on education is only part of a general system which tends to put everything under the care of the State. It is astonishing to see with what lightheartedness it takes up extra burdens when it is already staggering under a too heavy load. Formerly it was considered sufficient for the State to busy itself with the army and navy to guard the frontiers, to police the interior, to protect life and property, to ensure to each one the exercise of his rights and liberty; but the State has since broadened its views. Its mission is to become a universal automatic distributer, which dispenses in strict mathematical proportions packets of every commodity (education and religion included) required by citizens. You just put your money into the slot and draw out your packet. You are investing, say, in a little education; but when you open the packet you find that it does not contain the kind of education you want, just as automatic machines will supply you with the wrong kind of chocolate. You cannot put the chocolate back; you may, if you like, talk to the machine just to relieve your feelings; but you will produce no effect on its iron substance. You are even more powerless before the State machine; it is the only machine that supplies education, and it supplies only one kind.

The iniquity of a monopoly in education is fully admitted by M. Combes and his friends. During the campaign against the congregations we were continually being told that Catholic schools held a privileged position, a monopoly.[7] We may point out, however, that the monopoly enjoyed by them was the result not of privilegia, that is, of special laws passed in their favor to the exclusion of other teaching bodies, but of the excellence and up-to-date character of their teaching, which filled their schools and emptied those of the State. Let us suppose, for the sake of a parallel, that tobacco manufacturers found their trade rapidly dwindling because another firm by fair and open competition had succeeded in winning most of the trade for itself; and supposing the injured firms began to complain to the public and to cry "monopoly," the public, we take it, would not be disposed to sympathize with them. The protests of anti-clericals against what they are pleased to call the monopoly of congregationist schools are quite as unreasonable. Parents sent their children to these schools because the best article was to be got there; and, be it said in a whisper, many of the Deputies who vote with the ministry followed the example of these parents, just as Lord Byron chose a convent as the most suitable place in which to have his daughter educated. The will of the people as manifested by this popularity of the congregationist schools constitutes a plebiscite infinitely more valuable for the purpose of estimating the merits of the rival teaching bodies than the vote of a group of interested politicians. No, it is not the French Government that has the right to cry "monopoly." Their one object is to secure a complete control of education. And when they have realized their object, what use will they make of their privileged position? No doubt children's heads will be made the receptacles into which a number of "ologies" and "ographies," some useful, some useless, will be packed according to the latest methods of pedagogy and psychology. But what of their moral training? What of their religion? Truly the prospect is not a cheering one; for what can we expect from men whose only religion is the hatred of all religion, who have formally abolished the name of God, and who, by a refinement of insult, chose Good Friday as the most suitable day for removing the emblem of our redemption from the law courts? We may gather from an article in the *Revue Universitaire* (March 15, 1903) what kind of moral training the children will receive. The writer of the article, M. Adam, ex-professor at the Lycée Buffon, thinks it well to talk to children betimes

[7] *e. g.*, "Loin de représenter la liberté de l'enseignement, les congrégations ne représent qu'une des formes du monopole."—M. Combes in the Chamber of Deputies, March 18, 1903.

of the mystery of life; they must begin early their preparation for marriage, just as youths begin early to prepare for the baccalauréat or the ecole polytechnique. We do not care to quote much from the article, but the following will be sufficient to show M. Adam's drift: "I spoke this evening to the boys of the huitième:[8] 'The chaplain tells you that you must go to heaven; all I tell you is, prepare to live on earth, to be first of all good sons, and later on good fathers. Your, Jourdan, will be the father of a family; and you, too, d'Houdt. Just think that you will have a wife and children, like your papa.'" The reader may make his own comments.

We may resume all we have said by asking a few questions:

Who are the breakers of the moral unity of France?

Who are the sowers of discord?

Who are the enemies of progress?

Who are wanting in patriotism?

Who are the destroyers of liberty?

Who are the monopolists in education?

M. Combes answers all along the line—the congregations. Is he forgetting himself?

We cannot close this article without paying a generous tribute of praise and thanks to the Deputies who spoke in defense of the congregations. They were fighting in a lost cause; it was lost before a single word had been heard in discussion. But they were never disheartened. With magnificent tenacity they disputed every inch of ground, and before they fell, overwhelmed by sheer numbers, they succeeded in showing that the victory was due to injustice and hatred of religion.

Oswald Kellet, S. J.

Jersey Islands, British Channel.

THE TOTAL SUPPRESSION OF THE FRENCH CONGREGATIONS.

THE REAL REASON.

THE ministry of M. Combes continues its measures against Catholic schools and religious orders, especially those engaged in the work of teaching. A large number of establishments which were not touched by the first legislation against "unauthorized congregations," including many of the Christian Brothers, have been ordered to close their doors at the next commencement of the scholastic year. The present French

[8] In this class the boys are about eight years of age.

Executive appears determined that Catholic parents throughout the Republic shall have no alternative in the schooling of their children between giving it themselves personally or trusting it to the paid employés of the State.

The motive, in a purely political point of view, is not obscure. Patronage in France, as in other countries, is a valuable thing for retaining power even under representative governments. The larger the number of pupils in the State schools, the greater the number of teachers, and consequently of functionaries, dependent more or less on the administration. The administration on its side holds power as long as it can keep a majority of the Chamber of Deputies on its side, and a skillful distribution of patronage is a powerful means to that end. It is true the cost has to be borne by the population, the electors who choose the Deputies, but even that does not lessen the desire of the representatives, when elected, to pile it on when its expenditure brings profit to themselves.

The first legislation against the unauthorized congregations would, it was reckoned, add about two hundred thousand pupils to the public schools and about five thousand teachers to the list of places at the disposal of the administration, more or less directly. What the additional number will be in consequence of the second measure we cannot exactly say, but it will in all likelihood be double that quantity. The cost of the new schools and teachers will be larger, it is not denied, than that of the suppressed religious schools. So far it will be a heavy strain on the already enormous public taxation of France, but as a matter of practical politics it will increase the facilities of the Combes administration for securing a working majority in the Chamber. Public opinion moves much more slowly in ordinary times than government administration, and Republican officials with a majority to keep are as willing as Louis XV. to take chances of the deluge after their own term of office.

As M. Combes makes no claim to any higher principle of action than the necessity of a majority in the existing Legislature, it is likely the crusade against the religious orders and Catholic teaching in schools will go on until time brings a change in the composition of the Chamber and Senate. At present "le bloc," the combine formed by his policy among three or four sections of members, each distinct in its own objects, seems likely to hold together until the membership is changed by new elections. As the Deputies are elected for four years and Senators for nine, that change will not be immediate. Outside events like a great war are possible, which might cause a sudden overthrow of the ministry and reversal of its policy; but such need not be reckoned on with any assurance.

The growth of schools under religious congregations since the fall of Napoleon's empire was remarkable in France up to the legislation of Combes. In the colleges and *lycees* of the whole country in 1876 there were seventy-nine thousand students in the public and forty-six thousand in the religious establishments. In 1899 they had increased to eighty-four thousand in the State colleges, but in those of the religious orders they reached sixty-eight thousand. It was a difference in growth between six per cent. and fifty. In the primary schools under religious management there were four hundred and forty thousand pupils at the former date and one million two hundred and forty-five thousand at the latter. Those figures indicate the choice of the people of France as individuals in the matter of teachers. The interests of the public teachers were threatened by that choice and the ministry has made them its guide. It has, of course, found a formula less bald than the need of increasing patronage. M. Combes declares that Republicanism is threatened by the desire of the population to choose teachers for their children at will. The Dreyfus case, on which some credulous Catholics in England and America bestowed such sympathy, appears to have been, in fact, a mere intrigue of politicians to prepare the way for an attack on the growing numbers of Catholic schools and consequent increase of those others which serve as aids to political power in an administration.

There is a strong likeness between the present movement against the body of Catholic teaching orders in France and that of Choiseuil, the Minister of Louis XV., against the Jesuits in the middle of the eighteenth century. Hostility to their colleges as rivals had been kept up as a tradition by the old University of Paris and its fellow corporation, the Parliament or Supreme Court. The public opinion, however, sustained the Jesuits as instructors for nearly two centuries in monarchical France, as public opinion has been supporting the Christian Brothers and other teaching orders under the third Republic. During the reign of Louis, however, the ruling courtier class became as hostile to religion as any class of modern politicians from various causes. Choiseuil shared the sentiments of Voltaire and the Encyclopædia towards Christianity, though calling himself publicly a Catholic, even as M. Combes occasionally professes his respect for the national cult, while crippling its operation. The Royal Minister formed a combine among various parties of the courtiers and permanent officials of the Catholic kingdom, as Combes has formed his "bloc" from different factions among the elected Deputies. Choiseuil's supporters were made up from the public writers of the Encyclopædia, the Parliament and the University with the friends of each at court. His combination was

completed by the mistress of the King, Madame de Pompadour. That lady had been deeply offended by the refusal of a Jesuit to act as her confessor, which she desired as a mark of character to offset her relations with Louis. The ruling minister assailed the society as disloyal to monarchy, as M. Combes pronounces them enemies to Republicanism. The courts in the shape of the Parliament of Paris were utilized to give a form of legality to the expulsion of the most important body of public teachers in France without act of their own. It was, in some respects, like the policy of holding Catholic educators generally responsible for the alleged injustice of army officers to Captain Dreyfus, and then forbidding them to teach any longer.

In the case against the Jesuits the proceedings were based on a simple suit for debts contracted by the rector of a college in Martinique. The creditors sued the Provincial of Paris for the amount, on the claim that all members of the Order of St. Ignatius were liable for claims against any individual among them. The French Parliament, it should be remembered, was neither an elected nor an appointed body. It was a close corporation of lawyers, and its judgeships and offices were private property, open to sale and purchase like commissions in the English army, and even transmitted by inheritance. This body of judges further claimed repeatedly the power to make the laws as well as to declare them, and though not recognized by the government, this power was suddenly put in practice when the West Indian suit was laid before it as a judicial body. The Parliament, after hearing the statement of the debt of the rector of a college in Martinique, proceeded to try the orthodoxy and general character of the order, one of whose members had been called before it. The President ordered the constitutions of St. Ignatius to be submitted for examination by his court two hundred and twenty years after their formal approval by the Head of the Catholic Church. The court read the document and gravely pronounced it, by a majority vote, contrary to the law of France, the principles of the Catholic Church and those of the natural law. In consequence it pronounced the Order of St. Ignatius "inadmissible in any civilized State as against the law of nature and dangerous to both temporal and spiritual government." Its teachings, though sanctioned by several Popes in succession during two centuries, the Parliament judges declared "blasphemous, insulting to the Blessed Virgin, destructive of Our Lord's Divinity, dangerous to the safety of Princes and favorable to murder and parricide. They included the heresies of Luther, Calvin, Wiclif and Arius, and were contrary to the decrees of the Catholic Church and to natural and divine law."

They did not stop at this strong condemnation of the rule of St. Ignatius. They pronounced all its members guilty of a grave crime against the laws of France by joining the society and provided an appropriate penalty by the Parliament's own authority. All property held by French Jesuit communities was declared forfeited to the Crown. The members of the order were forbidden to live in community, to wear any religious habit, to exercise any priestly functions or to correspond with any other member. They were further ordered to take an oath not to follow the Jesuit rules and to maintain the Gallican theories of Church government as set forth in the four articles of the time of Louis XIV. Finally they were required to endorse the decree of Parliament itself and publicly acknowledge as true its charges against their own body. Failure in any of these conditions was to be punished by exile from the dominions of the King.

Such was the verdict on which the greatest teaching order of the Church was actually expelled from France as soon as the persuasions of Madame de Pompadour could induce the indolent King to give it his approval, as he ultimately did. "Those fools," wrote D'Alembert to Voltaire in comment, "who think they are working for religion are working for reason and don't know it. They are the hired hangmen of philosophy, and they don't suspect what they are."

Reason and philosophy are not the terms used at the present day as formulas for persecution of Christian belief or practice. Progress and Republicanism serve the same purpose for Combes as they did for Choiseuil. The Jesuits have survived the French monarchy and the Bourbon League. There need be no fear but the Catholic orders will outlive Combes and his "bloc," however France and its people may have to suffer for his policy.

In the modern suppression action of the legislature has been substituted for a royal decree, but in both the right of the individual to live according to his vocation is equally denied. The name republican is as little a guarantee against tyranny as that of modern enlightened government so generally used by the philosophers of the eighteenth century.

The bloc which enables M. Combes to carry out his policy is made up of three or four parliamentary elements. The Left and Right are the general names, which correspond to Liberal and Conservative in England. In French politics, however, there is more freedom of party than in England or the United States, and each great division is subdivided practically into Extreme and Moderate. Combes' actual party is the Extreme Left, and he holds the Moderate Left mainly by sharing the offices. The Socialists,

who repudiate the existing form of republic, are a strong body, and they have cast their lot with the ministry, in defiance of their own theories. The spoils of office and a special desire for confiscation of property, which has been partly gratified by seizing that of the congregations, are the ties that make them vote solidly with the ministry. The Masons in the Chamber, though not a numerous body, reckon thirty or forty. They are credited with giving a support which many of them would not give except for general dislike of the Catholic Church. The Masonic body, it should be said, is very much smaller in France than in the United States or England. Its membership is scarcely a twentieth of the lodges of this country, so that in proportion to population there are ten Masons in America to one in France. The association is not looked on favorably by the working classes, and still less by the Socialists. The peculiar feelings of its members towards the Church, however, help to make an alliance between Masons and Socialists for support of the ministry in its war on Catholic schools.

On the other side, some sections of the Chamber oppose the Combes ministry on other grounds than its proscriptive policy. They regard it as unnational and incompetent for any but bureau work and office holding. Henri Rochefort belongs to this class, and none is more bitter in his denunciations of "le petit defroque" than he. Rochefort is anti-Catholic, but also anti-Combes.

Combes' own abilities are considerable, but more in the line of manipulation of parties than national statesmanship. He is no orator and his personality is unsympathetic. The national expenses are swelling fast under his administration, and both the army and naval service appear to be deteriorating. He is unpopular with both classes, and the army in France means a majority of the young men of military age. His talents are rather like those which have made men like Mr. Platt, of New York, or Morton, of Indiana, powers in politics. They have their limitations, and M. Combes knows them, but scruples are not among the number, and it is doubtful if even strong anti-religious feelings are. He is a politician anxious to keep office and skilled in the manipulation of public men who can keep him there, and he is little more. His Cabinet is made up of mediocrities, with the exception of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, who showed much tact in the rapprochement with Italy.

The resemblance in character between Combes and Choiseuil, though the first rules under republican forms and the last as the loyal subject of an indolent King, is curious. Choiseuil was thoroughly skilled in the arts which made ministers in his day, but had no ability for national administration like Colbert or Richelieu. To

please Madame de Pompadour, whose indignation had been stirred by caustic epigrams of Frederick of Prussia, Choiseuil continued the Seven Years' War. Its incapable management cost France the loss of Canada and Louisiana. The best officers, like Montcalm and Lally Tollendal, were treated as Combes has served Marchand and the chief of the French squadron in the Chinese seas. Montcalm was left to die unsupported at Quebec, and Lally and Bourdonnais abandoned in India. The French influence in India was greater than England's when Choiseuil became ruler of France. It was annihilated at the same time that France's share in the American Continent was thrown away as a mere tract of swamps and snow. The gallant Lally was sentenced and executed on the Place de Greve after a trial like that given the Jesuits. The accumulation of national debt to a crushing point was another feature of Choiseuil's administration which is closely paralleled by that of M. Combes. It is remarkable that the fall from power of the former was not caused by either the peace of Paris, the execution of Lally or the dissolution of the French Parliament. It came from an intrigue among the court politicians like that which raised him to power. Maupeou, the royal chancellor, and the Duc d'Aguillon, with the help of another royal mistress, upset Choiseuil in 1770, after eleven years' ministry.

The action of Combes towards the Holy See recently on the Concordat has also a striking likeness to that of Choiseuil to force the suppression of the Order of St. Ignatius on the Head of the Church. Through the French envoy to Rome the threat was made of a schism like that made in England by Henry Tudor, and it is significant that it was conveyed through a courtier Archbishop, Bernis. Combes threatens the abolition of the stipends of the clergy through France and a possible seizure of the churches as public property. The execution of such a measure would certainly entail much injury to public worship and suffering to both clergy and Catholic laity, but the result which followed a similar policy at the time of the first Republic may well make the present rulers fear to do more than threaten. The attitude of the great majority of the French hierarchy to-day is notably bolder than that of their predecessors in Choiseuil's time. Combes does not expect to find another Bernis among its members to plead for the sacrifice of religious orders when they had become displeasing to his national government.

A personal experience of France to-day does not show any growth of irreligion or hostility to Church authority as a motive for the attack on Catholic schools. Like other nations, the popular mind in France is liable to periods of excitement, for causes more or less

reasonable, in which violent prejudices against particular classes may be developed. Such was the case in the first revolution against aristocrats and the Church, and to a less extent against Charles X. in 1829. There seems no evidence of such popular feeling behind the legislation of M. Combes. It comes entirely from the class of professional politicians and is directed mainly to strengthen the hold of the party in power on office. The social history of every nation long Christian shows periods of ebb and flow in its religious sentiments and practice. The France of St. Louis in the thirteenth century was more devoted to the Church than either France of the Albigenses before or France of the Huguenots after. The French people were more Catholic and better grounded in their religion in the seventeenth century than in either the sixteenth or eighteenth. The national religion as a whole was the same all through those variations of popular feeling. The nineteenth century, on the whole, has been marked with greater evidences of religious growth in France than its predecessor. As calm an observer as Cardinal Newman declared that the French people in 1860 were more thoroughly Catholic than at any time since the regency of Philip of Orleans, which marked a beginning of decay that culminated in the suppression of public worship by Robespierre and the convention. The fate of the Paris Commune in 1870, when it attempted to repeat the work of the Jacobin committee, showed that Newman was not mistaken. At the general election which followed the Prussian War the nation elected an overwhelming majority of members professing devotion to religion. The growth of Catholic schools since would seem to point to no reaction since in popular sentiment. It has been pointed out already that the motives of the late anti-Catholic legislation have been the political exigencies of the ministers and their majority in Parliament rather than the popular will, reasonable or not. It remains to examine how a people predominantly Catholic in open profession, religious in practice for at least a majority and electing its rulers by universal suffrage should find itself under an anti-Catholic administration.

Similar conditions, it should be remembered, have occurred at other times and in other countries. Both King and people were Catholic in Spain of the last century when the Aranda ministry was able to expel seven thousand Jesuits without charge or trial by a stroke of despotic authority, and without resistance of any kind. The same was the case in Portugal when Pombal as minister acted the part of Henry VIII. in Catholic England. Belgium established its national existence largely on the grounds of the religion of its people and their unwillingness to submit to measures against it of the Dutch Government. The Belgians are more completely

Catholic in profession than the French, as there are less than twenty thousand claiming different creeds in a population of seven millions. Nevertheless, under representative institutions this Catholic nation was ruled for several years by an anti-Catholic ministry even more hostile to religion than the Combes administration. Diplomatic intercourse with the Holy See was also long suspended by the rulers of Catholic Belgium.

It is clear from these examples that neither absolute monarchy, constitutional monarchy nor republican institutions in themselves furnish any sure guarantee against legislation hostile to Catholic interests even in countries where the State is distinctly Catholic and the population actually believers in the Church. Much less do they give it under non-Catholic governments where Catholics form but a minority. One sometimes hears comparisons between the condition of the Church in Catholic countries and those under Protestant rule. The Kulturkampf of Bismarck in Germany and of the Protestant majority in Switzerland may show what such are really worth. The Sultan's rule merits at least equal credit as far as toleration goes with those of England or Germany. It has nothing in its dealings with its Catholic subjects at any time to match the penal laws of the former down to late in the last century.

Before assuming that the anti-Catholic legislation of the present French Chambers expresses truly the sentiments on religion of the majority of the French people, a glance at the nature of the political parliamentary parties is necessary. At the formation of the third Republic after the war the legislative bodies divided themselves into Right and Left. The former was in overwhelming majority and was largely formed of Catholics devoted to their religion and some with inclinations for a constitutional monarchy as the eventual form of government. The Left included most of those who had been professed Republicans under the empire and who claimed a special right to the name even in a nation already republican. A certain number of its members, like Gambetta and Challemel Lacour, were hostile to religion, and they brought their hostility into their political action. The Left as a party aspired to control a majority and gradually won it in the course of years, much as power has been turned back and forward from Republicans to Democrats in the United States. Somewhat strangely the conservative tendencies of the French peasant proprietors was the chief cause of the change. The country population has an instinctive dislike of changes in form of the national government. It had been imperialist under Napoleon, and when the Republic was established by the fortune of war it transferred its sympathies to republicanism as the safeguard of stability. The leaders of the Left utilized

the conservative temper skilfully to win election for their nominees as the representatives of republican ideas, which they claimed were not held by the party then in control of the Republic, though they had actually framed it. It need not be denied that the politicians of the Left have showed more skill in what are familiarly known here as practical politics than their opponents. The members of the Right, who in the commencement had been mostly chosen for their character, under pressure of the calamities which the war brought on France were gradually displaced by more ambitious and more active men who struggled for election with the zeal of office-seekers. On securing control of the administration under Grevy the victorious party strengthened its hold by the extensive official patronage. It retains power by its use and by the fear of change of government among the country population, which condones details of administration for stability of its actual form.

Such are the circumstances which have put the French Government to-day under the control of professional politicians. As a matter of fact there are not many men of strong religious faith or devotion to principle in that class in France. We citizens of the United States can answer if there are many in our own country. There is a further element in French institutions which gives more sway to the purely professional politicians there. The French Presidents since MacMahon have been little more than figure-heads. They are elected, not by the people, but by the Legislature, and the present incumbent plays almost no part in the government. He is an imitation of an English parliamentry King without the weight which traditions and custom give the latter. A Prime Minister who can secure a majority of the Chambers has no check on his action, and nearly realizes the saying of young Louis XIV., "I am the State."

A bad feature of this condition is that the position of the ruler, thus absolute, is essentially unstable. He has no term of office and administrations may, and have often been, changed under the republic at a week's notice and on some question of mere party importance. The lack of stability in their parliamentary institutions is a constant theme among thinking Frenchmen. The desire of stability above all things is, moreover, exceptionally strong among the electors in France. Three-fourths of them are owners of real estate and more than four-fifths property owners. This condition is not paralleled anywhere else in Europe or America. It helps to explain the support which so many give in voting to candidates whose principles they dislike, but who have shown a capacity to retain power in the struggles of the Legislature. The same temper maintained the first Napoleon as Emperor when he had shown his

ability to overthrow the unstable Directory. It may not be commendable, but its existence is undeniable and this conservative spirit at present helps M. Combes.

It is not that French electors do not vote, as is sometimes supposed. Fully three-quarters of the registered voters usually take part in elections. The timidity about turning out a representative with administration influence, however, is very marked. There are nearly four hundred thousand officeholders among the ten or eleven million of electors, and the trained politicians of the Left use their influence strenuously. One feature of the activity of the party now dominant is shown in the rapid growth of debt and taxation since they came into power. It is most marked where the radical element is strongest, as in Paris, but it is enormous in all branches of the administration. In the ten years from 1889 to 1899 the debt of France was increased by over seventeen hundred million dollars. The taxation for general purposes only had grown twenty per cent. in the same time. The debt at the fall of Napoleon stood at two thousand four hundred million dollars. It reached six thousand millions in twenty-seven years of republican institutions and peace. Paris in 1899 had a debt of four hundred and forty millions. Last year it stood at a thousand millions. The methods of the practical politicians seem exceptionally costly in France. The fears excited on that head may more than balance the fears of the electoral majority to disturb the administration at the next elections. It is quite possible that the feeling excited by the measures of Combes may also find expression at the ballot-box, as the Catholic sentiment of the Belgians upset the Masonic Cabinet of Frere Orban in that country after tolerating it a longer period than any French ministry under the republic has endured.

The abolition of the Concordat and suppression of the salaries of the parochial clergy now paid by the State is spoken of as the next measure to be taken against the Church. If the Prime Minister decides on it, there is scarcely a doubt but it will be voted by his majority in the existing Chamber and Senate. The probable consequences at the next elections, however, are of a kind that may make even the most reckless administration pause. The sum now paid for support of the clergy, repair and maintenance of churches and other necessities of public worship is about forty-one million francs, or, roughly, eight million dollars annually. As the national budget reaches seven hundred millions, public worship figures for about one per cent. in the list of public expenditures. More than five times the amount is devoted to schools and the fine arts. The gain to the treasury from the suppression would be not worth counting to a practical politician and would be accompanied by a loss of the right to nominate candidates for the dioceses and higher church

dignities now held by the President under the Concordat. The right of nominating the Bishops has been held by government in France since the time of Louis XI. It was granted that shrewd monarch by Nicholas V. to prevent the danger of reopening the schisms which had been rather common after the close of the disputed Papal succession in the beginning of the fifteenth century. It is doubtful whether M. Combes will consent to give it up, even for the sake of saving the budget of public worship.

On the Catholic population the first effect would be to require it to make up by private and unequal assessments the sum which is now divided among all as a general tax. There is no doubt it could be done, though the effect would be probably to dry up many charities now existing. Some of us in America are inclined to think that Continental Catholics give less to charities than ourselves, but a study of the numerous works of benevolence and religion kept up in France by private gifts tells a different story. We may compare to that end the amount per head given to foreign missions by French and American Catholics respectively. It may also be recalled that there are, or were before the Combes legislation, a million and a quarter of children taught in Catholic schools supported by free contributions. There is no serious doubt felt in France that the parochial clergy will not be supported if the State salaries are suppressed, but the organization of methods to meet the change will cause an enormous disturbance of customs among the many millions of church attendants. The effect will be much the same as if in this country the children attending the public schools were required to pay individually for support of teachers and buildings instead of these being provided for by general taxation. Any one of political experience can tell what the effect of legislation compelling such a change would have on the public future of its authors in any American State. The suppression of the Budget of Public Worship would have the same, in all likelihood, on a French administration that tried it.

The subsidy for public worship, moreover, is not in the nature of ordinary grants for other purposes. It is a fixed sum allotted by the Consular Government of Napoleon as a compensation for the large church property seized by the Revolutionary authorities in 1792 and dissipated by sales among many hands. It is thus on a similar footing to the payments of interest on the public debt, and its suppression would be a step of repudiation. The popular sentiment throughout France owing to the wide distribution of public securities is more sensitive on the subject of repudiation of the debt than in any other country. It will be keenly excited by any measure which appears a beginning of it, and such the suppression of the

Budget of Public Worship undoubtedly will be held by a large part of the country. To array the financial fears of the population as well as its religious sentiments is a prospect which may make any administration pause.

In France, further, the lessons of history are more widely appreciated than in our new country, and the general repudiation which closely followed the first confiscation of church property is a familiar subject to all classes. Napoleon's provision of a State subvention by way of compensation for the property seized was not, it is well known, dictated by any scruples of conscience. It was entirely with him a matter of public expediency, and the reasons which swayed Napoleon's action are all in existence to-day. The Convention and Directory had tried the experiments of prohibiting Catholic worship in France and of leaving the worshipers to support it if they could. The hidden forces of society avenged themselves by sweeping one administration after another to rapid downfall. It was as a necessary element of social stability that the First Consul restored public worship in France and framed his Concordat with the Holy See. Stability of institutions is by no means yet too firmly assured in France, with its growing debt and fast fluctuating political parties. The sentiment of patriotism for the country is likely to be on the same side as religious feeling and financial timidity, and that side will not stand by the ministry which excites all three.

If it were possible to separate the purely religious interests of French Catholics from their general welfare, it may be that the complete separation of Church and State would eventually be more good than bad in its effects. The cessation of nomination of Bishops by the temporal rulers would be a distinct gain for the Church. The instinct of any Catholic population tends to the selection of its pastors by the spiritual authority which they represent exclusively. The Irish Catholics, even under the Penal Code, rejected spontaneously the offer of State support for their worship if connected with an interference of the State in the election of Catholic Bishops. The sentiment was fully as strong among the laity as the clergy, though the former had to bear all the burdens imposed by the independence of the latter from State control. Some Bishops, English and Irish, were even inclined to accept the veto had not public sentiment of the whole Catholic body pronounced so strongly against it. Catholics in France to-day feel scarcely less repugnance to nominations suggested by M. Combes than the Catholics of Ireland did to a like power in George IV. They naturally dislike the effects which may arise from a sudden change in the methods of providing for public worship so long established, but they are uncertain whether it would not be better to risk them than tolerate

the intervention, even to a limited extent, of statesmen hostile or indifferent to the Catholic Church in the selection of its Bishops. On the whole, the more zealous among the Catholics of France are much more ready to try the effect of a complete separation of Church and State than M. Combes seems to be.

One effect of the war on Catholic schools will be a revival of energy in public action among French Catholics. Whether it will be strong enough to overcome the habit of routine voting can only be told by experience. Here in America we are not exempt from the same habit. When a wave of open hostility like the Know-Nothing movement sweeps over the country American Catholics know how to cast their votes according to the dictates of conscience; but in ordinary times let any one ask himself how many Catholic voters pay attention to the moral principles involved in platforms or the personal character of party candidates for whom their votes are cast. The condition is not dissimilar in France. There is general confidence in the security of the Church and its power to outlast all foes. The sentiment is based on historic recollections as much perhaps as religious conviction, and it exists among many even of those indifferent or hostile to religion. There is hardly a city where some church building does not tell of the war waged on Catholicity by successive parties once all powerful, but now passed away, while the Church still lives on and shelters its worshipers as it did in the days of St. Bernard and St. Louis. In Amien's Cathedral the spot is pointed out where the triumphant Huguenots slaughtered Catholic prisoners within the sanctuary. In Orleans the Cathedral itself still bears the marks of Huguenot rule in the mutilated images of saints on its portals. Half the churches of Paris are daubed with the marks of Robespierre's Reign of Terror and the ten years' suspension of public worship that followed. Men point out how the cross which crowns the Pantheon has remained there on the present attempt to make that church a mere secular museum, and recall how twice before it was similarly seized by stronger hands than those of Combes, and after each it returned as by irresistible force to its original purpose. Huguenot and Jacobin have gone down to dust, but the material buildings of the Church they assailed so fiercely still stand. With such object lessons before the eyes no class of Frenchmen can indulge in the wild talk so common in the American and English press about the ruin of the Church by any legislative enactment. One does not read such predictions in either the Catholic or anti-Catholic journals of Paris or Lyons. The one point out the injustice and probable consequences of the Combes measures and the others defend or excuse them, but neither gives them the importance the sensational correspondents clothe them with in the foreign newspapers.

The confidence of French Catholics in the ultimate victory of the Church has a certain effect in lessening the energy of their resistance to individual attacks on its liberty or the rights of certain bodies within it like the religious orders. In this they are more like American Catholics than are the Catholics of Germany, Holland or the British Islands. In the latter men feel themselves called to more strenuous and open action in behalf of their religion. The Catholics of Prussia, Holland or Ireland have been trained by penal legislation of past years to see that their share in elective powers shall mean actual representation of themselves in the legislative bodies. In the German Reichstag the number of Catholic members is approximately a third corresponding to the number of Catholics shown by the census in the whole population. In the British Parliament the Catholic members are about seventy among six hundred and seventy, or about eleven per cent., while the Catholic element forms about sixteen per cent. in the whole population. In France at present, though fully five-sixths of the people profess themselves Catholics, not over forty per cent. of the elected Deputies claim the name. In our own country Catholics form only five per cent. in Congress and two per cent. at most in the Senate, though Catholics must reckon from twelve to twenty millions, or from fifteen to twenty-five per cent. of the electorate. In representation the German Catholics get nearly the proportion of Deputies that they have voters; the Irish Catholics practically the same; the French Catholics have scarcely a half, and the Americans a third of theirs. The English and Scotch Catholics, it may be added, are practically unrepresented in Parliament, though forming about six per cent. of the voters.

Some of the causes that lead French Catholics to allow their representation to remain in the hands of those hostile or indifferent to religion have been already pointed out as easily intelligible to Americans. They may be at least for a time removed by the stimulus of persecution of the religious orders. The next elections will show whether this is the case. It is remarkable that no question has been yet raised in Congress on the action of our own administration in the Philippines, which has been as extensive a suppression of Catholic teaching among a Catholic people as the first Combes measure. According to Mr. Taft's reports over two thousand Catholic schools have been secularized, and, further, a thousand Catholic priests refused for several years the right to return to their parishes. This deprivation of rights guaranteed by public treaty has not been done by legislation, but simply by administrative action. At the present moment seven millions of Catholics under jurisdiction of the United States are left with less than a thousand

priests because the present Secretary of War, an estimable Protestant gentleman and member of the Masonic society, thinks that the rest of the clergy who formerly conducted public worship among them "have not the slightest sympathy with the political principles which the American Government represents."

It is precisely the pretext which M. Combes has put forth to justify his proscription of Catholic teaching orders in France. He at least had no treaty obligations to restrain him from carrying his hostility into execution, and he gave it legal form by vote of his majority in the Chambers. Governor Taft ignored the treaty with Spain, which guaranteed the clergy of those islands the right to remain and continue their ministry there. He did so, as he has himself stated, because "if the friars were not sent back the political question would be eliminated." His action has been endorsed by the administration and himself called to a place in the Cabinet of President Roosevelt as a reward for it, and no voice that we know has been raised in Congress to protest against his proscription of the Spanish friars in the Philippines. Deeply as we may regret the apathy of French Catholics in political action, it is well for ourselves to remember the warning to cast the beam out of our own eye before we undertake to remove the mote from that of our neighbor.

B. J. Clinch.

San Francisco, Calif.

THE RENAISSANCE AND THE POPES OF AVIGNON.

THERE is probably no period in the history of the world in which the attitude of the Papacy towards art and letters has been so misrepresented by non-Catholic writers as that of the Italian Renaissance. If one takes up the works of such well-known historians of this period as Pastor Burckhardt and Symonds the conflict of opinion is so great that one almost despairs of getting at the real truth.

The charm of style in the work of Symonds is so seductive that for the moment misrepresentation and contradiction pass unheeded and one is swept along a current of rhetoric, dazzled now by the coloring of thought, now by the very atmosphere which rests upon the art headlands and uplands of this transition period.

The Italian Renaissance flowered during the fifteenth century, but it drew its nutrition from the soil of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The spirit of free inquiry and delight in beauty which are especially credited as belonging to the Italian

Renaissance had a place in the life and art of Italy as well as France long before the fifteenth century.

The Catholic Church has during no century prohibited free inquiry on questions that pertain to science, art and letters, and the expression of her life as represented in art and literature is but the reflection of that beauty which emanates from the source of all beauty—God.

It is not only unjust to the Catholic Church, but it betrays as well a superficial knowledge of the basis and genesis of Christian art to maintain that all great poetry, painting, architecture, sculpture and music had first soil in the wilderness of the world rather than within the sanctuary of God. So it is that non-Catholic historians, for example, turn their faces in every direction seeking causes for the great awakening of life and art in Italy during the fifteenth century, but are absolutely blind to the light and influence which streamed from the centre and headship of Christianity.

Non-Catholic historians would fain have us believe that the Popes of the Renaissance set their faces like flint against the revival of letters—that they feared it would emancipate the human intellect from the power of the Church. Indeed, Putnam, in his work dealing with the making of books during the mediæval centuries, states in two paragraphs in successive pages that the Pope had a certain work burned "because it was contrary to faith;" and again "because it was only obscene and contained nothing against faith and morals." The real truth is that the Catholic Church was the greatest factor in the Renaissance movement, and he who would understand the forces that contributed to this great awakening of the human intellect and the development of art and letters which followed logically in its train must understand the beginnings of the Renaissance in the fourteenth century and the share which the Popes of Avignon—then in exile—took in its promotion and extension.

The poet Petrarch is justly styled the "Father of Humanism," but were it not for the influence, kindly offices and patronage of the Papal Court of Avignon, the sweetest of Italian sonneteers might have lived unheeded—obscure in a lonely villa of Parma or Verona.

Let us then examine the share which the Popes of Avignon justly have in this great movement which filled the world of Italy of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as with the glory of a new and dazzling sunrise.

It should not be forgotten that the revival of classical learning in Italy really began early in the twelfth century with the revival of the study of Roman law. Italy was heir to the mid-day splendor of Roman literature, with its Virgils, its Horaces, its Ciceros, its Quintilians. Not only this, but as Carducci says, "By the fall of Constan-

tinople Italy became sole heir and guardian of the ancient civilization of Greece."

But it is a mistake to consider that it was the discovery of some manuscripts by Petrarch at Verona, or the appointment of Manuel Chrysoloras to the chair of Greek at the Florence University in 1396 that set aglow the skies of the Italian Renaissance.

A writer tells us that the growth of civilization is as gradual and imperceptible as that of an oak tree. It does not suddenly pass from night to day, not even from night to twilight. So was the Renaissance in Italy ushered in slowly, and the factors which contributed to this great intellectual awakening were indeed many.

Now not the least of these factors was the Papal Court, whether its influence went out from Rome or Avignon. It seems to me strange—nay, absurd, that historians of the Italian Renaissance eagerly gather up every vagrant straw that may contribute to their theory as to the cause of the great intellectual awakening of Italy in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but absolutely ignore the influence of the Catholic Church as a potent force in the Renaissance movement.

Non-Catholic historians are fond of quoting the Latin poet's words: "*Nihil humani est mihi alienum*," and hold that it was out of this spirit—this attitude towards the world and mankind—that the Italian Renaissance was born. This is quite true, but as Guiraud points out in his admirable work, "L'Eglise et Les Origines de la Renaissance," the need of simplifying and generalizing—of studying man in himself rather than any man in particular— could find recognition in the classical spirit only because it already existed in the spirit of the Renaissance.

One thing is quite certain, that it was the relation of the Papal Court to the Greek Church at Constantinople and the religious controversies that took place during the fourteenth century between Avignon and Constantinople that gave an impetus to the study of the Greek Fathers, a large number of whose works were in the Papal library at Avignon. In fact, relations of friendship bound together the men of letters of Avignon and Constantinople in such manner that there was often an exchange of manuscripts between the East and West. The life of Petrarch furnishes examples of this.

From the very beginning of the Papal occupancy of Avignon the Vicars of Christ enriched the library of the Holy See with numerous copies of the works of the Latin and Greek writers—now the works of Seneca, Pliny, Sallust, Suetonius and Cicero—now the Ethics of Aristotle and the Poems of Virgil.

As to theological works written in Greek, it was most natural that at a time when theology reigned incontestably as the chief of the sciences the Papal Library was well supplied.

It is true that the great masterpieces of Greek literature, such as the works of Homer, Hesiod and Pindar, the great tragedies, and the Latin writers, Horace and Tacitus, were not as yet well represented in the Papal Library in Avignon, but it is equally true that on the eve of the great schism the Popes had collected together an important number of manuscripts in which Latin literature was well represented, so that in the number and quality of the volumes the Apostolic Library was second only to the ancient libraries of the Sorbonne and Canterbury.

In several of his letters the poet Petrarch has shown himself very severe towards the Popes of the fourteenth century, who, in his eyes, were guilty of the double crime of being French and of having left Italy. Meanwhile the very literary reputation and glory which Petrarch loved so much were due in no small measure to the protection accorded him by the Popes of Avignon. Was it not, too, at the Papal Court of Avignon that Petrarch's father, an exile from Florence, had sought an asylum and in the sunshine of whose favor the poet himself had grown in peace and security?

It should not be forgotten, too, that it was from the Papal Curia of Avignon that the order first went out to search for the Latin manuscripts which were of so great service in the study of the ancient literature and language of Rome. The work of copying also went on, so that a manuscript copy of nearly every valuable Latin work was soon to be found in the Pontifical Library.

In collecting thus the scattered literary remains of antiquity, the Popes gave proof of an enlightened taste for letters, while at the same time they favored the movement born of humanism. As in our own day the Apostolic Library was thrown open to scholars, and the poet Petrarch, in several passages of his familiar letters, testifies to the fact that he himself had full access to the books and manuscripts of the Pontifical Library at Avignon.

Again, the missionary work carried on in Africa and Asia during the residence of the Popes at Avignon did much to bring in contact the mind of the Orient and Occident. Towards the close of the fourteenth century, before the Papacy had yet removed to Avignon, the Franciscan Jean de Montecorvino had established flourishing Christian missions in China, and in 1306 Pope Clement V. erected for him the see of Pekin. Numerous missions were also established in the Barbary States, in Northern Africa, as well as in Tunis.

If then the discovery of new worlds, the fall of Constantinople and the invention of printing were factors in the development of the Italian Renaissance, assuredly the mission work of the Papal Court of Avignon in its propagation of the gospel in distant countries contributed indirectly but incontestably to this great awakening of

the human mind. Indeed, "humanism" may be said to have had birth at Avignon within the Pontifical Court, with him who has been justly designated the first of "Humanists"—the poet Petrarch.

As to the study of Greek in Italy long before the dispersion of Greek scholars consequent on the fall of Constantinople in 1453, long, too, before the appointment of Manuel Chrysoloras to the chair of Greek at the Florence University in 1396, the monk Barlaam, a Greek scholar of great repute, a Calabrian by birth, who had passed his youth at Salonica and at Constantinople, where he became, thanks to his literary and scientific culture, a favorite of the Emperor Andronicus, was sent by the latter to Avignon to propose to Benedict XII. a reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches.

On his return from Rome in 1342, where he had received the laurel crown of poetry, Petrarch found Barlaam at Avignon and requested from him lessons in Greek. Another instructor of the poet Petrarch in Greek was Nicolas Sigeros, also a Byzantine envoy to the Court of Avignon. When the latter had terminated his negotiations with Clement VI. and had to return to Constantinople, Petrarch made him promise that he would search for manuscripts of Cicero, which might be hidden in the libraries of the Bosphorus. Sigeros, however, found none, but to show his good will he sent to his friend of Avignon a copy of the poems of Homer.

It was Petrarch's different visits to Rome that inspired in him a love for antiquity. His first visit to the Eternal City was on the invitation of his friend, the Bishop of Lombez, in 1337, and it is from this year that his Roman patriotism dates, which henceforth inspires all his works and in particular his Latin poem "Africa," and which, too, made him the enthusiastic friend of Rienzi.

A study of the life of Petrarch reveals the fact that it was the good offices of the Papal Court of Avignon which placed him in touch with the eminent Greek and Latin scholars of the day and made it possible for him, in the seclusion of Vancluse, to pursue his studies of the great masters of Greek poetry and philosophy.

Petrarch also prevailed upon his friend Boccacio to publish in Latin the Iliad and Odyssey. It was Leontius Pilatus who took charge of this work a little time after and thus began the great work of translating Greek authors which Pope Nicholas V. was later to bring to so successful an end.

But the works of the nature-loving Greeks would never have inspired in the heart and mind of Petrarch a love of the beauty of life around him—Hellenism was but a factor—were it not that his own beloved Provence revealed its charms to his eyes and filled his soul with poetic dreams. In his garden at Vancluse among his trees and vines he found the inspiration which Nature never

refuses to the open and responsive heart, whether the votary at her altar be a Wordsworth, amid the lakes and cliffs and scenes of Cumberland; a Burns, treading the hillsides of his native Ayr, or a Whittier, dreaming amid his Berkshire hills.

Many historians do an injustice to the character of Petrarch on the moral side. Petrarch, in the moral gospel of his life and living, was far from being either a Poggio or a Machiavelli. Much as was his respect for the master geniuses of antiquity, his love for the sacred writings of St. Jerome and St. Augustine was more profound, and it is said that on reading for the first time the works of the latter, he thought of abandoning altogether the frivolous study of the classics, with a view of consecrating himself entirely to Christian meditation and reading. Petrarch's respect for the Christian ideal is to be found in the marginal annotations of his manuscripts. We have the poet's own word for it that he took the "Confessions of St. Augustine" for his model when he wrote his "De Contemptu Mundi." Practices of scrupulous piety marked his whole life. Each night he arose to pray to God and on every Friday he practiced a rigorous fast, while his devotion to the Blessed Virgin was most ardent and sincere.

It is true that, like all men of the Renaissance period, Petrarch was intense in his character. He hated with a Renaissance fervor and he was not free from jealousy and vainglory which belonged especially to the spirit of his times.

In estimating the character of Petrarch one must remember the spirit of the times in which he had birth—that it was an age of great virtues and great vices and that excessive liberty to sin followed in the wake of the Renaissance in every land. In England it is reflected in the lives of such men as Green and Marlowe and in Marlowe's play of Dr. Faustus, while in France the courts of the House of Valois and the camps of the Huguenots were marked by the greatest wantonness and license. In Germany men like Ulrich von Hutten were anything but moral.

Petrarch was certainly "the morning star" of the Italian Renaissance, but it was the Papal Court of Avignon that made possible his light—it was the Pope as representative and head of a universal Church that quickened by contact the mind of the East with the West—in a word, it was the enlightened scholarship of fourteen centuries illumined by the rays of Divine Faith and speaking through the lips of the Vicar of Christ in exile at Avignon that led the way in that greatest of intellectual movements—"The Italian Renaissance of the Fifteenth Century."

THOMAS O'HAGAN, Ph. D.

Louvain, Belgium.

IRISH CATHOLICS, ENGLISH DISSENTERS AND THE EDUCATION ACT.

IT WILL be understood that the English Catholics have not a particle of independent political influence. There are among the old Catholics—we do not use the term in a South German sense—men of ancient ancestry, but they are with one exception lost in the Tory party. Their boasted descent, their fidelity to the Church, about which they are by no means silent, are assumed to give them a political importance in the eyes of the Irish representatives. It must be understood once for all that Irish Catholics are keenly alive to Catholic interests in England, in the army and navy and in the dependencies of the Crown. They are not moved in this direction by social ties or any ties connecting them with those of English Catholics. While helping Catholic interests, they distrust those excellent gentlemen, from the Duke of Norfolk down to a Mr. DeLyle, whose occupation a few years ago in the House of Commons was to behave with rudeness whenever an Irish member rose to speak. With regard to the noble Duke we can only say of him everything that is good in character and disposition. But even the head of the Howards should have been convinced the other day that he did not possess a shred of influence in the House in which next to the Lord Chancellor he is the first temporal peer. His motion to relieve the future sovereign from the necessity of swearing to declarations which many members of the Established Church regard as blasphemous was rejected at the instance of the successor of Dr. Cranmer and of the whole bench of Bishops. Indeed, we should be greatly disappointed if the Bishops could be found on the side of liberty and reason. Ever since the English Church became the creature of the State she has been the persistent enemy of the masses of the people; her Bishops have been faithful in every instance in the denial of justice to men outside her fold. Not an act of tyranny at home, not a war of aggression upon weak peoples, not an alliance entered into with the despotisms of Europe to crush the aspirations of subjects, not a combination of the powers to maintain the rule of the Turk and his pachas over Christian men and women, not one of these crimes against mankind and civilization but has had the support of the Bishops of England. From these observations our readers will perceive that we ask their attention to what we are about to offer concerning an alliance proposed on behalf of the Dissenters of England to the Irish members with respect to the recent Education Act.

The Dissenters have bound themselves to leave the Catholic

schools untouched if the Irish members aid them in obtaining a repeal of so much of the measure as endows the schools of the Establishment; or at the least if the Irish members do not support the Tories in defending their act. We readily allow that honest minds could be misled by pretences put forward in opposition to the proposed repeal. The measure when it was going through Parliament was described as a religious one; its introducer and his supporters declared that it was brought forward in the interests of religious education in opposition to a policy which would banish religion from the schools of all ranks and from the life of the State itself. To what extent this conception of the relations of Church and State had seized upon the Tory mind we cannot say; how sincere it was we cannot estimate, but it is the Catholic idea in normal relations of Church and State, and consequently calculated to win body and soul those Catholics who hold that the Tories are their natural allies. We may say in passing that English Catholics have not proved themselves conspicuously loyal to Holy Church on the temporal side; they were anxious that the Minister of the day might have a hand in the selection of the Bishops, and they were the first to adopt the Ecclesiastical Titles Act in refusing to the Irish episcopate their titles.[1] They discount the passionate devotion of the Irish to the Holy See as an expression of enmity to England. This, of course, is the stupidity of malice. When the Belgians, French and Irish sent men to fight for the independence of the States of the Church against the King of Sardinia and the outlaws and assassins of Europe, who were to be rewarded with the spoils of the Church and the revenues and offerings of political corruption when the new State should be established, we are not aware that a single English Catholic was among the volunteers. The only English Catholics who displayed courage at any time in Rome were converts or their sons, like young Noel, who shouted back defiance to the brigands after the occupation by the Revolution King on an occasion not to be forgotten.

The political outlook so far as the Dissenters and some Liberals who are churchmen is that on a change of ministry the attack on the Education Act must be made. Their reason is that it endows the primary schools of the Establishment at the expense of the taxpayers without distinction of creed or opinion. Another way to present their view is that it favors one form of Protestantism at the expense of the whole kingdom. It may be said that Parliament, representing the whole kingdom, passed the act, and it argues a

[1] A very interesting incident is that of a correspondence between the Lord of Shrewsbury of the time and Dr. MacHale who, in defiance of the act, signed himself John, Archbishop of Tuam.

contempt for the people to seek to set aside without a fair trial a measure they are supposed to have approved. On the other hand, it is contended that the majority were not speaking the public mind on the matter; and those who so contend appear to be right from the result of the by-elections, which have been a series of Liberal victories, and from the most recent intelligence from the constituencies. The last news from every part of England is that the condemnation of the government is more decided, the hostility of the electors more intense than could be inferred even from the by-elections.

It is hardly fair to describe the determination of the Dissenters as a policy of vindictiveness and exasperation disentitling the Opposition to support. It is true the Opposition in their place in Parliament are charged with responsibilities only second to those of the administration and in a degree closely approximating to the responsibilities of the administration. But it must be remembered that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons, expressed no opinion on the course to be taken when the party should return to power, and his lieutenants imitated his reserve. The party are not committed, therefore, to an attack upon the Education Act, notwithstanding the threats of the ablest and most earnest men among his supporters.

There are questions affecting England of incomparably more importance that this one. Since the government obtained power they have been moving at a constantly accelerated pace from the control of the House of Commons and the nation. They have embarked on undertakings of moment without the knowledge of the House; they have gone out of their way to seek entanglements with foreign and friendly powers in contempt of the criticism of the Opposition and the few independent and conscientious men among their own supporters.

These are matters demanding the attention of Parliament on a change of ministry. There is another grave offense against public liberty for which the government is responsible. Meetings were broken up, it is not too much to say by the contrivance of their agents—meetings expressly convened for the purpose of ascertaining the people's will as to the continuance of the war in South Africa after the government had declared that the war was over, and for the purpose of directing the public mind to the method of securing a real peace and its result in the establishment of a just government in the two republics.

The mere fact that the government had deceived the people as to the termination of the war and the fact that they preferred a policy of *vae victis* to winning the allegiance of the Boers are not

in themselves sufficient to show that the meetings in question were unlawful assemblies. Indeed, the government did not treat them as unlawful assemblies; the law is strong enough and clear enough to suppress assemblies of that character. Instead the government, through persons who knew their wishes, employed the bludgeons of rioters to prevent the censures that they feared from going forth to England and the world as the judgment of honorable men anxious to absolve themselves from an acquiescence in acts of injustice and cruelty.

It is seldom that the student lights on the instance of a government in England for two centuries carried on in defiance of the people and in violation of the privileges of Parliament. When Walpole held office by purchasing members of the House of Commons and the court manipulated the House of Lords, and particularly the Lords Spiritual, to assist him, there was some appearance of excuse in the intrigues believed to be carried on against the new dynasty by a large part of the clergy of the Establishment and by no inconsiderable number of the country gentlemen. Yet it was at this very period, when so many manor-houses and glebes were looking to the exiled Stuarts, that the Catholics in England were disappearing under the pressure of the laws and religiously minded men were leaving the Establishment to hear preachers in barns and to follow them into the fields. This was the time when English jealousy, as we shall show presently in a word or two, was killing the industries of Irish Protestants and legislating against their commerce. Why English Catholics should entertain so much suspicion of the Dissenters, who were for a long time fellow-sufferers with themselves from the Establishment squires and parsons, needs some explanation; but because it needs such explanation there is a *prima facia* in favor of an alliance between the Irish members and the Dissenters.

When Lord North, as the London alderman said, "was sleeping amid the ruins of his country" there was an administration to which in many respects the present government can be compared. Like this, that government stood on a plane of its own, above the thoughts, the fears, the hopes and needs of the nation. It is unnecessary to speak of it to an American, but we may say there is throughout a remarkable parallel between the two. Both drew the sword against the wishes of the best and wisest men in England and with a like lightness of heart; and both entailed upon their countrymen the like results of immense financial loss and loss of life, and on the Empire a loss of prestige the consequences of which, with regard to Egypt, India and the East, it is impossible to estimate.

Looking at the matter calmly we cannot perceive how the measure proposed to be repealed is of so urgent a character that such pressing questions as we have in view should be postponed until that repeal. There is the Irish question, one of the first importance. The situation in Ireland is bad, as Mr. Gladstone said of higher education there, "scandalously bad." The Land Purchase Act has not touched the essential point, the nature of the government and the social and political proscription of the Catholics in consequence.

Mr. Redmond and some of his colleagues have been recently in this country to obtain material and moral support for a conflict which he deems to be one of the most arduous character since the election which preceded Emancipation. The spell of Mr. Gladstone's eloquence and control over the masses in England and over the people of Wales and Scotland is wanting. We think the battle must be fought in Ireland, and it would be nothing short of a distraction to the Irish electors leading to disaster if they had reason to believe a cause which means everything to them should yield place to a question which is far from being the most important of English questions.

We have already suggested that the responsibility of the House of Commons to the country and of the government to the House are subjects of a more urgent nature than the repeal or amendment of the Education Act. We think that the right of public meeting should be placed in such security that meetings shall no longer be at the mercy of mobs. Even if the government were not implicated in the suppression of the meetings to elicit opinion concerning the transactions in South Africa, no one can deny that the first duty of the executive is to preserve the peace. There is too great a resemblance between the policy of the government in England and that of the Irish government, if we may abuse the word by such application, to permit us to think that the immunity of the English rioters was altogether accidental.

There are other questions: We cannot think the conditions affecting the representation of the people satisfactory. The servants of a Tory gentleman are electors from their dwellings by virtue of office; his household may conceivably swamp the dissenting village outside his gate. The protection of the ballot is perfect so far as its secrecy is concerned, but it affords no shield against suspicion on the one hand or fear upon the other. Again, there is the right which confers upon one man the privilege of voting in every constituency in the three kingdoms if he could physically accomplish the distances within the time. It is a survival of the tradition which made land and houses everything, man without them nothing.

Again, there is the question of higher education in Ireland, which the leaders of both parties have over and over again agreed should be settled. The Education Act by endowing the Establishment schools may have been the worst victory ever gained by the Tories. That institution was already laden with many burdens of unpopularity without the addition of this one. The cynical violation of the laws against simony, daily practised by English churchmen, could hardly have been an argument for entrusting them with so much control over the coming generations as the Education Act confers. Scorn and contempt will not be wanting to those who dislike the English Church and appreciate the anomaly.

Another matter is some change concerning the closure. The House is dishonored by making the guardian of its privileges its tyrant under the pretence of the dispatch of public business. One regrets to see that great office with which the growth of the constitution is so closely connected so changed that not one of the historic characteristics survives; nothing remains but the chair and the trappings. We think of the day when Charles I., with his guards, his court gentlemen and his braves of Alsatia, proceeded to the House and surrounded it to intimidate the speaker; but in vain, for then the speaker was the servant of the House. He is now its master and the instrument of the government.[2] We think that a recasting of the rules and an amendment of the procedure of Parliament generally would be more germane to the matter when the Liberals return to power than an onslaught on the Education Act. At present the House of Commons can be dispensed with. The clerks can continue to register the decrees of government on the bare will of the Treasury bench. The presence of representatives of the people is a mockery. Cromwell and the army were clumsy in their methods to deprive the Commons of power as compared with the men of to-day. Pride's Purge was a poor officer in comparison with the appropriation of unofficial members' days. The mace is no longer the "bauble" Cromwell called it; the bewigged figure to which it is attached as emblem of the power and

[2] The history of the closure is a striking argument in favor of a separate legislature for Ireland. It had its origin in what was impudently characterized as the "obstruction" of certain Irish members to the business of the Commons. The Tories in opposition demanded at a time of intense public excitement that stringent personal measures should be taken against a few Irishmen who were charged with abusing the forms of the House to the purpose of factious delay. This Mr. Gladstone was too conscientious to attempt; for in all they had done the Irishmen were technically within the privileges of members. We moved that the rules should be amended to confer on the Speaker the power to summarily close debate on the motion of a member. This power was not exercised against the Tories on the Home Rule bill of 1893, though their tactics were factious if the epithet has any meaning.

authority of the Commons of the United Kingdoms of Great Britian and Ireland in Parliament assembled we hold to be the "bauble." At any rate, if the Opposition evinced an unguarded disrespect of the majority in their anger and disappointment by threatening to repeal the education measure, they were clearly within their rights in insisting that the government had not gone to the country on that issue, had distinctly repudiated that and all other domestic issues and had only asked its confidence on the war in South Africa. The contention is legitimate that the government received no mandate to endow the schools of a wealthy Establishment out of the pockets of small shopkeepers, small professional men, clerks and artisans who believed that good, sound Protestantism was to be found in chapels and meeting houses, where no surplice offended their eyes and no coat-of-arms over a squire's pew, with its griffins and boar heads "dentatis gulis," recalled to stern and thoughtful men the images on Pilate's ensigns which roused the Jews to madness verging on rebellion.

In the few words we are about to say it must be understood we are dealing with an alliance and a policy and not at all with the question of religious education. For Catholics the nature of education to be accepted is settled by authority. As for education for the children of churchmen and Dissenters, we respectfully submit that that is their own affair. The Dissenters and such Radicals as belong to the Church of England acknowledge that Catholics have proved out of their poverty they will accept no education for their children save a religious one. It would be contrary to their principles if Radicals and Dissenters refused to recognize the supreme claims of conscience. It may be true that formerly the sectaries, as they were called, opposed religious education for Catholics; it may be true that at one time they were more intolerant than the Established Church itself towards Catholics. Still we think that with regard to their feelings towards Catholics in the distant past there is some misconception. We are not by any means clear that any appearance of more favorable feeling on the part of churchmen towards Catholics can be referred to a spirit of toleration or to any sort of constant and intelligent policy. The laws that plundered Catholics and proscribed their priests, that would not allow Catholics, as such, one particle of civil rights, were passed in Parliaments in which Bishops voted as Lords Spiritual, but in which Dissenters could not sit owing to disabilities that made them aliens.

The idea has been prevalent that churchmen were at all times more friendly than the Dissenters to the Catholics. This we deny, and we could explain our denial if our space permitted. We may content ourselves with pointing out that certainly since the Revo-

lution the Dissenters had no power to oppress the Catholics; that all power was in the hands of the churchmen, and that they did not let it slip. They exercised it with a strength and vigilance which compelled the diminishing number of Catholics to hide themselves out of sight. There would have been hardly a Catholic in England at the close of the eighteenth century only for the Irish immigrants who began to find their way thither and the Frenchmen who fled from the Revolution in their own country. These last were received hospitably for reasons not far to seek. They were looked upon as martyrs for the cause of their King and for aristocracy, with which, most unfortunately for its highest interests, the cause of religion in France was supposed to be identified.

It must be apprehended in the spirit of fair play that the alliance proposed between the Irish members and the Liberals and Dissenters is not for the purpose of dealing with a single measure in no way affecting the interests of Irishmen or the rights of the Catholic children when the schools of the latter are safeguarded against attack. Such an alliance is clearly based on the consciousness of identity of aims over the whole field of political and social reform. So far as such an alliance would be seriously entertained as one offensive and defensive, one to a degree merging the Irish members in the Liberal party, it could be only on the revival of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule policy and in the pursuit of what may be described as a democratic policy generally. We express no opinion as to the way the Education Act affects the Dissenters. It may be there is something they have to complain of, but it is allowable to suppose that the main injury is on the point of honor. It cannot be to any extent on the ground of oppressive taxation, and this so strikingly and injuriously burdensome that repeal cannot be allowed to wait until the burning questions of social amelioration and political liberty are solved. The union of Irish Catholics with the Dissenters is not to be confined to a small matter like the repeal of an act endowing State Church schools or to rest upon such a movement. The first question is Home Rule; all others are auxiliary or subordinate to this. Is this a dictation by a superior interest to the inferior with regard to the conditions of alliance? It means nothing of the kind; it is simply a revival of the policy of the party when it was last in power—its policy when Mr. Gladstone spoke as the embodied spirit of the English democracy.

What we say is very plain. If there be any degree of enlightened patriotism among Englishmen, anything like the intentions of self-interest in private business, the Radicals of all kinds, including all the Dissenters, now must see that justice to Ireland means the

advancement of civil and religious liberty in England and the end of privileged classes, lay and clerical.

We repeat that the principle on which fair play to Ireland stands embraces also the policy of liberty and justice for the masses in England. Opposition to Home Rule can offer no justification for itself, if this be indeed a justification, but that Ireland must be governed by a minority of the inhabitants for their own exclusive benefit. This describes the servitude of a nation to a class, the people to an oligarchy, a conquered race to a few tyrants and their guards. It was the rule in Peru and Mexico under Spain, in India under the East India Company when British subjects exercised unlimited and irresponsible power. When we feel we are in presence of a question so awful in the far-reaching elements that compose it, a subject so deep in its tragedy as to touch the line dividing the tortured reason from despair, we are forced to ask what is an Education Act in England to Irishmen? What have they to do with churchmen's children and Dissenters' anger at the special care for them by the State? Such interests, all interests beyond the channel and over the seas that gird the Empire which Irishmen have done so much to build up, are as nothing to the ebbing life of their nation.

We can assure the Dissenters that Irish Catholics will never be wanting to their cause; it is that of liberty and reason; but before all rights, before the thought of redressing inequalities and injustices sustained by Englishmen is the almost lifelessness of Ireland lying there now that she has emerged from the valley of the shadow. Irishmen must, by their own inheritance of contumely and wrong, by the high discipline of pain endured, give their sympathy and when practicable their aid to the victims of injustice and oppression in every form and degree, whether a sentimental survival like the Dissenters' grievances for the most part, or an unspeakable tyranny like that suffered by the Poles under Russian satraps; but such sympathy and aid are subordinate to the claims of the pale mother lying on the sands of time, her powerless arms flung as when first she fell on reaching the sea under the rising stars.

The fact is, if Irishmen were not to labor for the cause of man, in due subordination of course to their country's claims, one would look upon them as a people of slaves, who suffered because the lash was their birthright and contempt their inheritance. But theirs has been a struggle that saw the rise and disappearances of States, the settlement and unsettlement and resettlement of every power in Europe. They have been faithful to the rights of freedom, not as the enemy of Britain, as Catholic Tories say, but in our poor mind because Britain has been in so many places the enemy of freedom.

We ask our friends the Dissenters to bear in mind that, as we write, a few of the inhabitants enjoy all social and political power and influence and have their hands on the pulse-beats of commercial enterprise in all its classes;[3] and asking this we lay down to them the fundamental condition of the compact, that such a government as that in Ireland must be sent to join the dead tyrannies in the Inferno reserved for the social hypocrisies and lawless codes that have killed men's minds and broken their hearts since the beginning of institutions for government.

That is the situation in Ireland, in appearance at least, despite the Land Purchase Act. There is a good deal of excitement about this measure between the popular leaders. There is one thing very certain, that it has proved what we anticipated, that the landlords were not to be reconciled until the establishment of a native legislature compelled them to seek their own advancement in promoting the general interests of the country.

What we have in Ireland is political and social degradation of the masses, coupled with a theoretical power of the agricultural interest among the masses to acquire the ownership of a considerable portion of the soil. But beneath this conditional ability to buy the land is the conviction from which the mind cannot free itself that possession of the land will not bring with it what it always carried as its concomitant in every other country, the enjoyment of political power and social esteem. This consciousness is wrought into the texture of the soul, it is strengthened by the air around, it is whispered, it is echoed, it is thundered by the chorus of nature animate and inanimate. It is as if the nation were dying, despite every legislative improvement "conceded" by the Imperial Parliament.

Some such image of the dying nation lay before the eyes of Grattan when speaking the last words for freedom in the Irish House of Commons; but with that sanguine temperament united to the energy of genius he foresaw the day of her returning life. To him she was only in a swoon and the beauty of life was on her lip and cheek. To us the swoon is as death; we see it in the nerveless hand, the fallen discrowned head, a sight more rending to the heart than a requiem echoing and sobbing in the gloom of cathedral aisles. This thought of our nation, child of the imagination and the heart, is no fantasy; it is a feeling as of the passing away of kindred nearest in love; it belongs to all of us, high and low; it is our union with the ideal and sublime, and feeling this way it is no wonder we should be impatient of little policies and the intrigues of wire-pullers.

[3] This is substantially true with regard to business, and absolutely true with respect to office under the Crown.

It is necessary that all sections of opinion in England should understand that Irish interests cannot be postponed or sacrificed to the theories or views of men who have no place with us in thought or feeling. There are English Catholics who expect the Irish members will deem themselves the unintelligent delegates of their will. If they wish Irish members to take their orders they must qualify themselves by adopting the principles which lifted the policy of the illustrious Manning to a height and comprehensiveness worthy of his great predecessor, St. Thomas, worthy of the great ecclesiastical statesmen to whom justice was the law of public life and because it was this, enabled them to harmonize the human and divine in the movements of society. If they cannot do this, let them go to such Irish members as Colonel Saunderson and the Ulster kettle-drummers. There are too many painful memories to permit us to approve of the influence over Irish members of these very respectable gentlemen who are not shocked because legislation for a Catholic university was consigned to the limbo of pretences or good resolutions at the ukase of Lord Londonderry.

When we find these gentlemen and their Tory allies raising hands of virtuous indignation because an alliance between Catholics and Dissenters has been proposed, we must ask is it with their approval the Crown in a prosecution involving public passions and interest will order Catholics to "stand by," as the phrase goes? This is a token that the Emancipation Act has not emancipated; that the lives and fortunes of Catholics are at the mercy of an insolent faction as much to-day as when they were sent to the fleet or to the American settlements if a French ship appeared upon the coasts, or compelled to make good out of their chattels and effects the losses sustained by Protestants from an Algerine corsair or through preparations for a defense against a rumored invasion, too often the invention of those to be compensated by the levy.

The system still surviving in Ireland is, in principle and inspiration, the work of a conquest that secured its power by the policy of dividing the people through a separation of their interests. Misgovernment is all it has been, except that over its more hideous features a mask has been drawn in deference to world-wide opinion and the force of events. Irishmen must look to the men who adhere to the principles of Burke and Fox and Gladstone for national regeneration. They are branded with inferiority over the entire range of administrative wherever the Irish government, through its bureaus, can exercise influence or control; and they are so branded with the assent and, we fear, the active approval of English Catholics of position. The system pervading public and social life in Ireland is unlike anything spoken of in books of

history. It is a despotism, not of an individual, but of a body professing a form of religion, and the form itself vague and wavering as a finely textured cloud. It cannot be compared with any oligarchy of the past, so indefinite and shifting is it, but reaches all beneath it as effectually as if armed men did its bidding and spies and informers watched its interests. The leases of its life, the fundamental principle, cannot be discovered; it is simple and invisible as a spirit and so escapes analysis; as a famine, as a pestilence, so it con be seen only in its effects.

Hence the doctrinaire and the economist, with like wise men or French philosophers of the eighteenth century, say: What the Irish need is more "stick," more disarming acts, insurrection acts, curfew acts, life and property protection acts and added to these the loss of representation in Parliament and the suppression of their press. If the country were a prison from which no complaint or groan could issue to the civilized world, things would be fairly well, not quite so well as if the wish of an English member of Parliament were realized, that the island should be submerged in the Atlantic for twenty-four hours.

It is rather trying to one's patience that the unfortunate people of Ireland should be subjected to a monstrous tyranny, to an unexampled social oppression for the benefit of England, or what was regarded as that, and then maligned because they are discontented with and impoverished by the connection. It is true that Englishmen admit much of their iniquitous legislation and the ferocity of the wars that from time to time converted parts of Ireland into wildernesses. The elaborate system of laws which prevented the growth of trade and manufactures is now looked at with a shaking of the head; but it is ancient history, and no longer of interest and effect. There were navigation acts of which we seldom hear, but they were measures of exclusion of Irish exports and of protection of English exports to the North American colonies and the West Indies, skillfully conceived and ruthlessly carried out, to the detriment of the colonies as well as the extinguishing of every attempt at commerce between Ireland and them. Let us see how English legislation worked when almost the entire land of Ireland was in possession of the men Mr. James Anthony Froude loved to call the English in Ireland. We are speaking of the eighteenth century, when the landlords and moneyed classes in Ireland, the men engaged in trade, if we can call the paltry exchanges between England and Ireland by that name, and the men engaged in the exportation of wool,[4] black cattle and sheep were the sons or grandsons of the

[4] It was an indictable offense punishable by fine and imprisonment to manufacture fabrics into which wool might be woven as a mixture even.

adventurers and soldiers of the Long Parliament and the Commonwealth.

Wool could not be manufactured in Ireland. It was a crime to attempt it. It would be safer to be a Catholic layman—provided one was not an Irish gentleman within the meaning of the 10th statute of Charles I. and the other statutes embodying the same—than a Protestant daring to make a yard of woolen cloth. It could only be exported to England, and to certain seaports in that country. Meat could not be exported thither in consequence of an objection by the English cattle dealers, who were great butchers as well, unless it was corned. Corned meat could not be exported because the English developed a capability of producing a supply of it to their own markets and the army and navy. All this is delectable reading, but some Irishmen have had the impudence to start a movement in Ireland in support of Mr. Chamberlain's policy of protection, and this with the history of English Parliamentary action towards Irish industries in our knowledge. A more important thing infinitely than the taxation of the English public for the State Church schools to the Dissenters and their Irish allies is the utter routing of Mr. Chamberlain and the classes who follow him because his new scheme will drive needful reforms from the mind of the masses.

In a future article we shall reiterate our faith in the necessity of education based on religion. While insisting that certain English Catholics shall not address the Irish representation as though they had authority or right to dictate to them, we are sure those members will never forget the claims and interests of the Catholics of England in those respects belonging to general justice or in the special matters with which as Catholics they are entitled to be heard. We do not consider the Tory Education Act one of these matters, when there is security from those who will be the chief element of the next administration that whatever it has done for Catholic children shall be respected and confirmed.

We are not enthusiastic, indeed, about a measure which entails upon a small minority of the inhabitants of England, and they the poorest, an expense of over a million sterling before they can receive one farthing from the taxes in aid of education. This, as our readers understand, is the position of the Catholics under the act. If their schools are not in a condition to satisfy the local authorities, not only will they not receive aid from the State, but in their place secular schools shall be and are authorized to do the work of education side by side with those of the Establishment. It is in the highest degree probable the entire money will not be raised in time; and so there is a danger that many of the Catholic schools may

disappear. We mention this particularly to repudiate the notion which certain English Catholics have put forward against the alliance spoken of above, that Catholics should be so grateful to the Tories as to have lost the right to enter into such an alliance, as though the Tories had acquired a mortgage on their support.

It has been stated, too, by the Tories and certain English Catholics that the security offered to the Irish Catholics with regard to the schools in England is for the purpose of beguiling them. Good Catholics inform us that the Dissenters when assisted by the Irish members in overthrowing the Establishment schools will then turn round upon the Catholic schools and secularize them. We refuse to argue with prophets. We simply declare we do not believe them. We can see excellent reasons for a distinction in the view of Dissenters between Catholics deferring to a supreme authority in matters of faith and morals and Protestants who base their religion and principles of conduct on reason simply. In this respect they cannot see any difference between themselves and the episcopate and clergy of the Established Church; and we ourselves are a little curious to know in what respect English Catholic laymen and their clergy can discover a distinction between the private judgment of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ripon on the one hand and the private judgment of a Dissenting divine upon the other. The lawn sleeves and the black gown or ordinary walking coat are not matters of judgment, public or private, so much as of taste. But the garb, plus the loaves and fishes of the Establishment, is the distinction. Many churchmen and all Dissenters will say which can be most clearly ascertained. In any case we are not concerned in the doctrinal differences between them, but we have a most important political interest to ourselves in this, that the Dissenters are our friends; a great political duty in this, that the Dissenters, who are admittedly as good Protestants as churchmen, are kept in a state of religious subordination, of social interiority by the latter and that they must be elevated from the one and freed from the other degradation. We need not insist on an inequality that is obvious, but we do on an insolence borne with singular patience, namely, that the clergy of the Establishment will not allow the status of clergy to the Dissenting ministers. But this is not all. The cruelty exercised at parish burial places when the parson and his servitors will not permit the dust of a dead Dissenter to mingle with the kindred dust of parents or near relatives is a crime which calls for the axe of the woodman.

We had intended to speak at more length about the subtle and invisible influence which defeats reform acts, jury acts, land acts, making the Irish Catholic a freeman, indeed, in the eye of the law,

but powerless to confer upon him the rights and privileges of freedom. The spirit of the ascendancy pervades every institution—government, arts, industry, public charity and religion. It rules the mart, the camp, the court, the ordinary intercourse of man and man. This may seem astonishing if not incredible. Why, if two men, strangers to each other, meet in Ireland the first question to be asked is: "What foot do you dig with?" The answer tells whether the speaker is a Catholic or Protestant as he replies right foot or left. Yes, the Catholic, though a free man in name, is worse than a slave in this respect, that he is a freed man without a portion, that is, degraded and unprotected in a social system which refuses him recognition.

We had intended to show that as between the Dissenters and churchmen there was no conceivable reason why the private judgment of the latter could claim a higher sanction than that of the Dissenters. We had in view to point out that Catholics, resting on divine authority for present guidance in faith and morals, had no power to hand over the education of their children to a secular or hostile control; that they stood apart from the churchman and the Dissenter, stood apart from each and all the shades of dissent as they do from the variations of opinion that find shelter within the Establishment; but enough has been said to indicate what we hold should be the policy of the Irish Catholics in Parliament. In a word, we do not believe it can ever be the policy of the Tories to remove the incubus of the old ascendancy from the Irish Catholics. They would cease to be Tories if they attempted this. This was the meaning of Mr. Wyndham when he spoke at the introduction of his Purchase Act of the oligarchy in Ireland as men who had borne the racket of dynastic wars; but he failed to add, wars the memory of which is made the justification of the riots of Orangemen acting with the consciousness of high countenance behind them. To us this oligarchy, this strange, amorphous, abysmal product is not a class so much as an evil and ominous influence, doing its deadly work on the people through a press in Ireland and Britain that defames them and through bureaus in Ireland which, possessing all the powers of administration, exercise them to perpetuate distrust and indignation. This being our view, we can only conclude that the place of the Irish Catholics is by the side of those with whom they have stood shoulder to shoulder in all the struggles for the rights and liberties of both and with whom they broke through the first great barriers to freedom in 1893, when the Home Rule bill was passed by the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland.

George McDermot, C. S. P.

New York.

CHATEAUBRIAND.

ONE of the most fascinating things for the human mind is the revelation to it of a splendid specimen of the human kind. When a man, superior to his fellows in his gifts, strips the veil from himself and one sees the springs of his soul and is admitted to a knowledge of their most intimate activity, this self-exposure adds to the charm of such revelation. Lastly, if the transcription of such a life evidences the closest connection with and influence upon his times and contemporaries and the term of its existence is so lengthy as to have been in touch with many generations and with basic changes in government and society; to have made acquaintance with widely separated regions of the earth and to have had personal contact with those most famous in them, then there remains one mere excellence which such an autobiography may possess, viz.: to be set forth in a style which in itself is a delight to cultivated persons.

An autobiography which is unique in comprising all of these grounds for interest is the "Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe," by François René, Vicomte de Chateaubriand. It is one of the most interesting of romances, and its charm, while it cannot fail to affect all, will be most strongly perceived and enjoyed by the Catholic. This brilliant piece of literature by one who created that romantic school in which shine Victor Hugo, Lamartine and George Sand, as well as many lesser yet scintillating luminaries in letters, was first published more than half a century ago; but, singularly enough, when one considers its worth, only within the last two years has it been translated into English. Hence it will appeal to the generations of the present day as a new thing.

The translator of these six plethoric volumes from the original French deserves high praise for the excellence with which he has accomplished his task. Alexander Teixera de Mattos, Dutch by birth, has resided in England for the last thirty years and received his education there, first at the hands of Mgr. Capel and then at Beaumont College, conducted by the Jesuit Fathers.

In an introductory note he explains how he came to undertake so arduous a task, which engaged him for three years. He once asked M. Pierre Louys, that exceedingly modern French writer, if there was any nineteenth century author whom he read and approved of. To which the other animatedly replied: "Chateaubriand. His 'Mémoires d'Outre Tombe.' That is monumental. That will live forever." The ardor of Louys' affirmation roused a keen desire in Mattos to read the work in question, which he did

some months later, having run across a "poor little pirated edition" in several volumes at the house of his uncle, in Amsterdam. He says: "I carried them to my room, spent three weeks in their perusal, and came back to London determined to find a publisher who would undertake the risk of an English translation. I found one almost at the first asking, and it will ever remain a mystery to me why no complete translation of this admirable work has seen the light in England during the more than fifty years that have elapsed since they were first published." They have found that "complete translation" now, thanks to Mr. Mattos.

In an appendix to the sixth and last volume Mr. Mattos avows his sentiments toward the author of these prodigal "Mémoires," while he, too, modestly deprecates the praises accorded to his gracious rendering of them into English. He says: "The reviewers of the first four volumes have done more than write universally favorable notices; not only have they appraised at its true worth what is, perhaps, the greatest prose work of certainly the greatest prose writer of nineteenth century France; but they have spoken of the translation in generous terms of praise which I cannot feel that I have deserved. But I thank them for their kindness and I only wish that I could have earned it by devoting as long a time to the translating of these 'Memoirs' as Chateaubriand did to the writing of them. That would have been thirty years; but I should have known scarce a dull moment."

Mr. Mattos is far too humble. Not only has he made this record of Chateaubriand's life seem quite as if originally set down in English, but he has patiently annotated it, adding his own foot notes to those of M. Edmond Biré, editor of the latest French edition of the "Mémoires," from which Mattos made his version. Those which Chateaubriand appended are very properly retained. Each of the three is distinguished by an appropriate letter, A., B. or T.—"author," "Biré," "translator."

Materially and in point of taste the publishers, Freemantle & Co., London, and G. P. Putnam's Son, New York, have treated this important literary production with due consideration. The paper and letter press are excellent; the portraits, selected by Mr. Frederic J. Simmons, are judiciously chosen, and the purple and gold of the binding is in happy accord with Chateaubriand's aristocratic lineage. Almost the first words with which he really begins the "Mémoires" are: "I am of noble blood." The family name was originally written "Brïen," softened into "Briant," then "Briand." "About the commencement of the eleventh century the Briens gave their name to an important Breton castle, and this castle became the burgh of the Barony of Chateaubriand." There is a Keltic flavor

to "Castle Brien" which breathes from the author in this work. Geoffrey Baron of Chateaubriand accompanied St. Louis to Palestine, and that monarch in reward for his services granted to him and his heirs in lieu of his old arms (fir-cones with the motto, *Je seme l'or*) an escutcheon "gules, strewn with fleur-de-lys, or without number." This proud souvenir of the saintly Louis stands in gold on the cover of each volume of this edition. *En passant*, Chateaubriand lived up to the motto as a "gold-sower!"

Chateaubriand began his "Mémoires," "this 4th day of October, 1811, the anniversary of my saint's day (St. Francis of Assisi)," at the Vallée-aux-Loups, a small country house seven miles south of Paris, near Châtenay, which he had purchased four years before with money derived from the sale of his writings. "I have bought it with the price of my dreams and my vigils; I owe the little wilderness of Aulnay . . . to the vast wilderness of Atala." As Chateaubriand was born in Saint Malo, Brittany, on September 4, 1768, he was forty-three years of age when he thus began the transcription of a career already regarded by him as concluded, so far as great achievements were concerned. He finished its revision and corrections September 25, 1841, at the age of seventy-three. He died on the 4th of July, 1848, seven years later. So he began writing his life when he was little more than half through it, and the prosecution of this congenial pastime, or duty, as one may choose to consider it, occupied him for thirty-one of the thirty-seven years he was still to live. This splendid edition of it, the only worthy one in English, and for which thanks are due to M. de Mattos, was brought out forty-four years after Chateaubriand had taken possession of that solitary tomb from which it pleased his mournful fancy to date these fascinating "Mémoires." It is a work which demands serious consideration by virtue of its literary value as well as for the renown, somewhat faded in our day, of its author.

In the preface to his "Mémoires" Chateaubriand gives a summary of their content and unpremeditatedly sounds the note which is their dominant one throughout, one full of revelation of his character. He says: "I tell the story of my childhood, my education, my youth, my entrance into the service, my arrival in Paris, my presentation to Louis XVI., the early scenes of the Revolution, my travels in America, my return to Europe, my emigration to Germany and England, my return to France under the Consulate, my employment and work under the Empire, my journey to Jerusalem, my employment and work under the Restoration, and finally the complete history of the Restoration and of its fall.

"I have met nearly all the men who in my time have played a part, great or small, in my own country or abroad; from Washington

to Napoleon, from Louis XVIII. to Alexander, from Pius VII. to Gregory XVI., from Fox, Burke, Pitt, Sheridan, Londonderry, Capo d'Istrias to Malesherbes, Mirabeau and the rest; from Nelson, Bolivar, Mehemet Pasha of Egypt to Suffren, Bougainville, Le Perouse, Moreau, and so forth. I have lived successively through the empty years of my youth and the years filled with the republican era, the annals of Bonaparte and the reign of the Legitimacy. . . . I have carried the soldier's musket, the traveler's cudgel, the pilgrim's staff; I have been a seafarer, and my destinies have been as fickle as my sails; a halcyon, and made my nest upon the billows.

"I have meddled with peace and war; I have signed treaties and protocols and published numerous works the while. I have been initiated into the secrets of parties, of court and of State; I have been a close observer of the rarest miseries, the highest fortunes, the greatest renowns. I have made history and I could write it. And my life, solitary, dreamy, poetic, has gone on through this world of realities, catastrophes, tumult, uproar, in the company of the sons of my dreams, Chactas, René, Eudore, Aben-Hamet; of the daughters of my imagination, Atala, Amélie, Blanca, Velleda, Cymodocée. Of my age and not of it, I perhaps exercised upon it, without either wishing or seeking to do so, a three-fold influence—religious, political and literary." This last sentence is a just epitome of himself and of his career.

"From my early youth until 1800 I was a soldier and a traveler; from 1800 to 1811, under the Consulate and the Empire, my life was devoted to literature; from the Restoration to the present day it has been devoted to politics.

"During each of my successive careers I have always placed some great task before myself. As a traveler I aimed at discovering the polar world; as a man of letters I have striven to reconstruct religion from its ruins; as a statesman I have endeavored to give to the people the true system of representative monarchy, accompanied with its varied liberties. . . ." This last is the key to any seeming inconsistencies in Chateaubriand's political career.

"Of the modern French authors of my own period, I may be said to be the only one whose life resembles his works. A traveler, soldier, poet, publicist, it is amid forests that I have sung the forests, aboard ship that I have depicted the sea, in camp that I have spoken of arms, in exile that I have learned to know exile, in courts, in affairs of State, in Parliament that I have studied princes, politics, law and history.

"I have found myself caught between two ages as in the conflux of two rivers, and I have plunged into their waters, turning regret-

fully from the old bank upon which I was born, yet swimming hopefully toward the unknown shore at which the new generations are to land.

"These 'Memoirs,' divided into books and parts, have been written at different times and in different places. . . . In this way the various events and the changeful circumstances of my life enter one into the other; it happens that, in moments of prosperity, I have to tell of times of penury, and that in days of tribulation I retrace my days of happiness. . . . My cradle bears the mark of my tomb, my tomb of my cradle; my hardships become pleasures, my pleasures sorrows, and one no longer knows whether these 'Memoirs' proceed from a dark or a hoary head.

"A year or two spent in solitude in some corner of the earth would suffice to enable me to complete my 'Memoirs;' but the only time of rest that I have known was the nine months during which I slept in my mother's womb. It is probable that I shall not recover this antenatal rest until I lie in the entrails of our common mother after death.

"Several of my friends have urged me to publish a portion of my story now. I could not bring myself to accede to their wish. In the first place, I should be less candid and less veracious, in spite of myself; and then, I have always imagined myself to be writing seated in my grave. From this my work has assumed a certain religious character which I could not remove without impairing its merit. It would be painful to me to stifle the distant voice which issues from the tomb, and which makes itself heard throughout the course of this narrative. None will be surprised that I should preserve certain weaknesses, that I should be concerned for the fate of the poor orphan destined to survive me upon earth. . . . Life does not suit me; perhaps death will become me better."

With which words the preface concludes. These extracts from it will give the reader a good idea of how the "Memoirs" read; for the writer, despite his passion for rhetoric and the metaphor, speaks truth in his assertions, and the flavor of a finely strung, strongly egotistic nature, tinctured with melancholy almost from its birth, lends poetic and sympathy-inspiring charm to all the personal and abstract reflections of François René, Vicomte de Chateaubriand. There is a tendency to amplification which at times is almost simple reiteration; but this is the fault of one whose imagery is a bubbling font and whose love of the phrase would have found vent in the Thebaid.

It may seem excess of good measure to give in addition to the preceding extracts the concluding paragraph of the "Mémoires;" but as it is the last stroke of the pen, it is worth transcribing here.

Chateaubriand was seventy-three years of age when he wrote this final sentence to his monumental work. "As I write these last words," he says, "on the 6th of November, 1841, my window, which looks west over the gardens of the Foreign Missions, is open; it is six o'clock in the morning; I see the pale and spreading moon; it is sinking over the spire of the Invalides scarce revealed by the first gold ray from the east. One would say that the old world was ending and the new commencing. I behold the reflections of a dawn of which I shall not see the sun rise. It but remains for me to sit down by the edge of my grave, and then I shall descend boldly, crucifix in hand, to eternity."

The reader reflects that he has fulfilled this prediction half a century ago. Yet the vivid actuality of this voice from the grave is absolute.

The incidents, variety and protracted span of Chateaubriand's life are as fascinating as a novel apart from himself as the centre of them, while his strange Ego, so full of delicacy, passion, strength, weakness, melancholy and romance, lies like a violet mist over all that he did, or suffered, or wrote. His ardent and enduring regard for Madame Récamier, and that extraordinary woman's soulful and utter allegiance to him have set radiantly in the history of human nature the very paradigm of friendship between man and woman. This one feature of their lives would suffice to enshrine them both in the memory of all their human posterity as rare example of a relation of the sexes as unusual as it is beautiful and exemplary.

If Chateaubriand were not the willing and felicitous commentator that he is upon the events and phases of his own existence, an intelligent and sympathetic reader of them could in most instances supply as acute and correct a commentary. Chateaubriand was more versatile than complex in his make-up of heart or brain. He is in the order of genius, but rich and winning rather than great. He is almost as self-conscious and overt as that rascally braggart, Benvenuto Cellini. He is more spiritual than carnal, more persuasive and imperious than coercive and masterful; rather the sensitive creature of circumstances than their subjugator or moulder. He is the René of his own pen, melancholy as the whip-poor-will's note, persistently, almost electively, sadder than a single star

> That sets at twilight in a land of reeds.

Chateaubriand gives at the beginning of his "Mémoires" quite a detailed account of his forbears and the antiquity and genealogy of his line. Then he says: "I ask pardon for being obliged to stoop to this puerile recital in order to account for my father's dominant passion, which forms the key to the drama. As for

myself, I neither boast nor complain of the old or the new society. If in the first I was the Chevalier or the Vicomte de Chateaubriand, in the second I am François de Chateaubriand. I prefer my name to my title. Monsieur my father would readily, like a certain mighty land-owner of the Middle Ages, have called God 'the gentleman on high.' "

All this recalls Cicero's caustic pleasantry about philosophers writing little books on the contempt of glory and inscribing their names thereto. Yet Chateaubriand's suave hauteur, which would mask itself as humility, is positively engaging.

One family tax due to nobility of birth is strongly evidenced by the laws of inheritance in Brittany. Through them the eldest son received two-thirds of the property, while the remaining third was distributed equally among the other sons, how numerous soever they might be. Chateaubriand's father, René, was a younger son, and took in the situation with such practical appreciation that at the age of fifteen he bade farewell to home and his mother to strike out for himself and make his fortune. He did so in the merchant service. This is the author's description of his gloomy, stern, haughty sire: "M. de Chateaubriand was tall and spare; he had an aquiline nose and thin, pale lips; his eyes were deep-set, small and of a bluish or sea-green color, like the eyes of lions. I have never seen an expression like theirs; when inflamed with anger each flashing pupil seemed to shoot out and strike you like a bullet."

This pleasant gentleman whose sole passion was that of his name, was silent and deliberately avaricious, solely with view to restoring the family to its pristine splendor. He married at thirty-five and brought his wife to Saint Malo. Each of them had been born within a few leagues of this Breton town on the sea. She was so opposite in character to her husband that her naturally gay if religious temperament was crushed out of her. "For piety my mother was an angel," writes René, her youngest and most gifted child.

Chateaubriand was the last of ten children. The first four died in their earliest infancy. The fifth was a son, Jean-Baptiste, who later married the granddaughter of M. de Malesherbes. Then came four girls, "all four endowed with rare beauty." Here follows a naïf declaration on Chateaubriand's part which is very characteristic: "Probably my four sisters owed their existence to my father's desire to assure the perpetuation of his name through the arrival of a second boy. I resisted; I had an aversion to life." Poor René! how much he got of it both in years and vicissitudes. But he could feel that it was through him his terrible father realized his ambition. Never has any other Chateaubriand become world-known. He

was christened on September 5, 1768, the day following his birth, receiving the name of his paternal grandfather, François, and of his father, René.

"My Christian names are François René and not François Auguste," writes Chateaubriand, and Biré supplies this foot-note, explaining why "Atala," the "Génie du Christianisme," the "Martyrs" and the "Itineraire" are signed François *Auguste* de Chateaubriand: "The author's object in suppressing the name of René on the title pages of his early books was to avoid a false interpretation on the part of those who might have been tempted to identify him with the immortal episode in his works which has René for its title."

In a house in a dark, narrow street of St. Malo, while the winds that preluded the autumnal equinox shrieked so rabidly that the wails of the poor baby, "almost dead when he first saw the light," were rudely silenced, François René was born to a name "which I have nearly always dragged through misfortune."

Some four years before Chateaubriand's birth his father realized one of his ambitious desires by the purchase of Combourg, an old chateau built in 1016, and which had been held by various branches of his family through their intermarriages with the Coëtquens. It suited his feudal pride to possess as his an old ancestral seat.

The little François was left to the care of the servants. He speaks feelingly of his old nurse, Villenauve, but as he grew a little older he and his youngest sister, Lucile, four years his senior, became playmates, and throughout life she was his favorite. They filled thoroughly the rôle of neglected children. "Saint Malo is a mere rock," attached to the mainland by a causeway called the "Furrow." The young ones used to play on the sands and little islets, one of which, the Grand-Bé, is now the glorious tomb of that little wistful Breton boy.

When he was seven his mother took him to Llancoët "to be released from his nurse's vow to the patron of the hamlet, Our Lady of Nazareth," to wit, that he should wear blue and white in her honor for seven years. "If ever I have known happiness it was certainly in that house of my grandmother de Bedée," he exclaims fervidly. At ten o'clock on the morning of Ascension Day, 1775, the whole family went to the Church of Our Lady of Nazareth, the little François dressed in a white surtout, with hat, gloves and shoes of the same innocent color, while a blue silk sash encircled his slender waist. The white coat was hung up as an *ex voto* beneath a picture of the Virgin, and the prior spoke to the demure little chap of his crusading ancestor who had fought with Saint Louis of France. It is a pretty picture. Then he returns to St.

Malo, the small bleak town he compares to Venice, which from the days of Henry IV. had distinguished itself by its devotion to France. Jacques Cartier, who discovered the St. Lawrence river, is one among the many brilliant seafarers who were natives of St. Malo. There, too, was born the unhappy Abbé, Felicité de Lammenais, whom Maurice de Guerin used to speak of as "Monsieur Fèli" with enthusiastic tenderness.

"The children's meeting place is the strand of the open sea, between the Castle and the Fort Royal. Here I was reared, the companion of the waves and winds. One of my earliest delights was to fight with the storms, to play with the waves which retired before me or chased me across the beach. . . . The ragamuffins of the town had become my dearest friends. I resembled them in all things." At home, however, the training was very severe. The children had to eat what was set before them; they were not permitted to go near the chimney; they hadn't a sou to spend. His old nurse and the devoted Lucile helped to mend his torn clothes at night. On the days of the village fairs François would sit aloof and solitary on the rocks in penniless rebellion and watch the seagulls, stare at the wide blue sky, gather shells and listen to the refrain of the sea among the ledges. A sailor's hymn to the Blessed Virgin was one of the first things he learned by heart. He inserts it in his "Mémoires" and adds: "To this day I can repeat these bad rhymes with as much pleasure as Homer's verses." As soon as he had a past it became his favorite mental diet.

In the spring of 1877 the Comte d'Artois, afterward Charles X., paid a visit to Saint Malo, and the little Chateaubriand watched the young prince from the bastian of the powder magazine. "In his splendor and in my obscurity how many unknown destinies lay hidden." In view of their later relations with one another this touch is picturesque.

This first book, which gives the picture of Chateaubriand's childhood, is especially interesting. To these "empty years" of childhood may be traced the melancholy which is the constant food of Chateaubriand's soul and his poetic sensitiveness. The lonely child, strangely reared, sucked in from the sea and the sky and the rocks the nourishment of his genius. He says: "What is certain is that it imbued me with ideas different from those of other men; what is still more certain is that it impressed upon my sentiments a character of melancholy which arose from the habit of suffering acquired in the age of weakness, improvidence and mirth." So far from feeling resentment against his stern parents, he declares that "their sternness is almost pleasant to me. . . . From my mother I derive the consolation of my life, since it was she who

taught me my religion. . . . Would my intelligence have received a greater development had I been set earlier to my studies? I doubt it; the waves, the winds, the solitude which were my first masters were probably better suited to my native disposition. Possibly I owe to these wild tutors virtues which might have remained unknown to me. . . . What God does is well done; it is Providence that guides us when it destines us to play a part upon the world's stage."

All of which is preëminently Chateaubriandesque—that is, charming, self-centred and tunefully triste. It breathes the ever pervasive egoism, but it also speaks of the tender acquiescence which is endearing if not very exalted. It is the first chapter of René's life.

Among the influences which chiefly helped to determine the character of this forlorn, impressionable boy was that of his youngest sister, Lucile, like himself neglected and given to "long, long thoughts." She was a tall, thin, loose-jointed girl, dressed in the ill-fitting, cast-off frocks of her sisters. "No one would have suspected in the puny Lucile the talent and beauty with which she was one day to shine," adds Chateaubriand, after describing the sister who had a jealous devotion for him and toward whom he entertained the feeling of a protector. Throughout her tenebrous life he seems to have cherished her with greatr regard than he entertaind toward any other member of his family. One is prone to feel the undue estimate of affection in his appreciation of Lucile.

In the spring of 1778, when Chateaubriand was ten years old, the entire household migrated to the sombre old chateau of Combourg in a huge old-fashioned berlin, with eight horses to draw it, bells at their collars and bright colors in the housings. It was a proud day for Chateaubriand père and an exciting one for the younger René. "While my mother was sighing and my sisters talking themselves out of breath, I looked with all my eyes, listened with all my ears, was wonderstruck at each turn of the road: the first steps of a Wandering Jew who was never to stop. Even then, if man only changed his surroundings! But his days change and his heart." Though Chateaubriand writes of this trip when he was forty-four years old, he says: "I have been obliged to stop; my heart was beating so violently as almost to push back the table at which I am writing. The recollections awakened in my memory overpower me with their force; and yet, what are they to the rest of the world?" They are the touch of nature which makes the whole world kin.

One will quickly become used to this blend of humility and egoism which René exhibits repeatedly, and it is eloquent of his charm that it does not become tiresome. Happily, it did not deter

him from this task of minutely and elegantly setting forth for "the rest of the world" the full four-score years of his existence.

The Castle of Combourg was a severe solid mass of masonry, softened slightly by the towers with their conical tops. The elder Chateaubriand was human enough to be a little brighter over the arrival of his family. "A supper served in the guard room, at which I ate without constraint, ended the first happy day of my life. True happiness costs little; when it is dear it is not the true metal." But Combourg was a solitary, dead spot and the child who had nurtured his poetic soul on the sea and the winds which blew about the gulls was to find more melancholy aliment in the tranquil woods and country stretches in which it was set.

After a fortnight he was taken, not without tearfulness, to Dol to college by the Abbé Porcher. Although the boisterous life of a boarding-school did not appeal to him, the lad took promptly to his studies, developing rapid progress in mathematics and in Latin. The latter shaped itself so facilely into pentameters for the young scholar that his teacher dubbed him the "Elegist." His memory also proved phenomenal. During the "Mémoires" Chateaubriand alludes gratefully to its reliability. In the third year at Dol an unexpurgated Horace and a history of "Confessions mal faites" fell into his hands. Also Masillon's sermons and the Æneid. These produced great perturbation of ideas in his sensitive and innocent soul. But he says that as antidote "there was born in me the sense of honor, an exaltation of the soul which preserves the heart incorrupted in the midst of corruption." This sense of honor made him refuse to be caned by the prefect at Dol when he was caught bird-nesting. Chateaubriand admits that haughtiness was the fault of his family. "In my father it was hateful; my brother pushed it to a ridiculous length. . . . I am not sure that I myself, in spite of my republican inclinations, have entirely shaken it off, although I have been careful to conceal it." In truth, he has not done so.

These artless touches reveal the man more than he intended, and the astute reader will form his own estimate of him above or below that of his statements.

One may imagine what his First Communion was to a boy of this extreme sensibility. The child's future condition in life is decided on by a French family at this event. His confessor could not reconcile the boy's distress over his sins with their triviality as confessed. "All the vain renown that has since attached itself to my name would not have given Madame de Chateaubriand one moment of the pride which she felt as a Christian and a mother on beholding her son prepared to participate in the great mystery of religion." On Holy Thursday he "was admitted to the sublime and

touching ceremony which I have vainly endeavored to describe in the 'Génie du Christianisme.' I trembled with veneration, and the only material thing that occupied my thoughts was the dread of profaning the sacramental bread."

Then follows this remarkable sentence, which would appear to have been written by the inexperienced boy of seventeen years instead of the middle-aged man who really penned it. Chateaubriand, neither by his own showing nor by the testimony of others, suggests a passionate man. Yet he says with almost puerile importance: "Those who compare these ardors with the transports I shall presently depict, who see the same heart experiencing within the space of three or four years all that is sweetest and most wholesome in innocence and in religion and also all that is most seductive and most baneful in the passions, will choose one of the two forms of joy; they will see in which direction to seek happiness and, above all, peace."

Soon after this he left Dol and went to Rennes, where he was to prepare for his entrance into the French Naval Guard, from which the officers of the navy are drawn. Rennes College, one of the most important in France, was founded by the Jesuits in 1607, but was a commercial college when Chateaubriand studied his mathematics there. He met here Limoëlan, who through his complicity in the explosion of the infernel machine (December 22, 1799,) was obliged to fly to America. When he reached New York he wrote to his betrothed to join him. But M'lle d'Albert had vowed to devote herself to God should her lover escape, and she urged him to do likewise. He took the name of Clorivière, entered the seminary in Baltimore, became a priest and devoted the whole of his fortune to pious works; one, the reëndowment of the Convent of the Visitation in Georgetown, D. C. Oddly his betrothed, who survived him many years, never became a religieuse through lack of a vocation, but always led a life of virginity devoted to good works. Despite these interesting facts regarding Limoëlan, some of which he must have known, the one recollection Chateaubriand preserved of him in these "Mémoires" was that he painted the only portrait then extant of Lucile!

One more quotation concerning this period may be permitted as illustrative of the author's talent and bland exploitation of it. He speaks with no niggardly laudation of his success in his studies. Then he adds: "This intellectual suppleness was again apparent in matters of secondary importance. I was good at chess, handy at billiards, a good shot, an expert swordsman; I drew tolerably; I should have sung well if my voice had been trained. All this, added to the manner in which I was brought up and to the life I led as a soldier and traveler, produced the result that I have never played

the prig nor displayed the stupid self-sufficiency, the awkwardness, the slovenly habits of the men of letters of former days, still less the conceited assurance, the jealousy and the blustering vanity of the new authors."

To the judicious reader of these "Memories from Beyond the Tomb" this naïf blast of self-praise is indeed descriptive of their distinguished author quite aside from consideration of the somewhat varying ones which his cotemporaries have given. M. de Chateaubriand was only five feet four inches high! But from what a height he regarded men and things!

After two years at Rennes he left for Brest. His cadet's commission had not arrived, and he waited for it. One day, while sleeping upon the beach, pompous reverberations awakened him. The French squadron was filling the harbor with detonating men-of-war on their return after the Peace of Versailles, 1783. Everybody hastened to meet the officers and men when they landed, and Chateaubriand suddenly found himself embraced by a sturdy youth. It was Gesril, the boy bully of his Saint Malo days, destined to die heroically at Quiberon. "Gesril's sudden appearance and departure made me take a resolve which changed the course of my life." On seeing his friend depart Chateaubriand dropped everything and left for Combourg. The reader is quite prepared for the statement which follows:

"I am to this day astonished to think how, in view of the terror with which my father inspired me, I could have dared to take such a resolve; and what is quite as astonishing is the manner in which I was welcomed. I had every reason to expect transports of the most furious anger, and I was gently received. My father was content to shake his head, as thought to say, 'Here's a pretty trick!' My mother embraced me with all her heart, grumbling the while, and my Lucile kissed me in an ecstasy of joy." Chateaubriand's three sisters were now married, and the lone Lucile must indeed have rejoiced at the return of her old-time companion.

These unique "Mémoires" are like the game of "Bridge," where one has to be careful not to play from the wrong hand. The simile is suggested by the manner in which Chateaubriand connects the present, in which he wrote, with the past, about which he wrote, all of it now a half century ago, for the reader of to-day. This blend of periods is most notable at the beginnings of the books of the "Mémoires." His return to Combourg, after throwing up his prospects in the navy, ends Book Second. He begins the third thus: "Three years and six months have elapsed between the last date attached to these 'Mémoires,' Vallée-aux-Loups, January, 1814, and the date of to-day, Montbossier, July, 1817. Did you hear the Empire fall? . . . The previous chapter was written under the

expiring tyranny of Bonaparte and by the light of the last flashes of his glory. I am commencing the present chapter under the reign of Louis XVIII."

He is writing from the chateau of Malesherbes' granddaughter, and the twittering of a thrush on a birch tree swept his mind back to Combourg, where he had, forty years before, so often listened to like notes from one of the Breton brothers. He compares the sadness of these days with the sadness of these later ones. "That was of the kind which springs from a vague longing for happiness, at a time when we are without experience; the sadness I now feel comes from the knowledge of things appreciated and judged. . . . The hours fly and drag me with them; I have not even the certainty of being able to complete these 'Mémoires.' Let me make the most of the few moments left to me; let me hasten to depict my youth while I am still in touch with it."

Chateaubriand had declared a desire for the ecclesiastical state on his return from Brest, thereby forswearing a naval career. He went to the College at Dinan to study to that end. "The truth is," he confesses, "I was only seeking to gain time, for I did not know what I wished." The life at Combourg was dreadfully dreary. The father and mother, Lucile and René were the entire family, and the sister and brother were each others great consolation; both of them melancholy, poetic, eager, affection-starved children. "I grew up by the side of my sister Lucile; our friendship was all our life." Their chief pastime was walking in the Great Mall. Hearing René discourse eloquently on solitude and nature, Lucile would say: "You ought to write all that down." "These words revealed the muse to me; a divine inspiration passed over me."

Chateaubriand ascribes Lucile's melancholy to a secret passion for a young friend whom her elder brother brought with him to Combourg on the occasions when he made short visits there. During the Terror Combourg was turned into a gaol, and Lucile was imprisoned in the Convent of the Good Shepherd. After her release she married a M. de Cand. He was nearly seventy and she thirty-one. Even this poor protector was lost to her within less than a year.

At this period in Combourg Chateaubriand chanced to be thrown into momentary contact with a pretty woman. "From that moment I was aware that to love and be loved in a manner quite unknown to me must be the supreme happiness. . . . For want of a real object I evoked, by the strength of my vague longings, a phantom which never left my side." This ideal woman was a composite, whose eyes, hair, complexion, graces and lure were borrowed from the village maidens he had seen; from the portraits of *grandes dames*

of the time of Francis I., Henry IV. and Louis XIV., which adorned the funereal salon at Combourg, and—proof of the clean and religious character of this young Catholic soul in the bewildering thraldom of awakening passion—even the pictures of Our Lady in the village church were levied on by his eager heart for the last refinements of spiritual charm. The invisible companion which a lonely child so frequently evokes was here to the life. This first affection of the heart is of interest when one recalls that last friendship of this same man with the most beautiful woman of her age which endured for thirty years; in fact, until this exquisite woman stood at his death-bed and with the failing vision of her own old eyes saw René's, which had looked so long upon the world and men, close forever. She was more than the embodiment of his young imagination's eclectic fashioning, and their friendship was the most soul-stilling joy the restless, sensitive Breton ever knew.

With such a triumph in the difficult realm of ideal friendship as the crown of his life, this paragraphy in the "Mémoires" is not without its own pathos. "On emerging from these dreams, when I found myself once more a poor, little, obscure Breton lad, without fame, beauty or talents, who would attract the looks of none, who would *pass unknown, whom no woman would ever love*, I was seized with despair. I no longer dared lift my eyes to the dazzling image I had attached to my steps."

This delirium lasted two full years, and as one reads the description Chateaubriand gives of his soul, his communings with nature and the eloquent phases of earth and sky which swayed him then, the truth of what has been said of him by Chenedollé is demonstrated: "Chateaubriand is the only writer in prose who gives the sensation of verse; others have had an exquisite feeling of harmony, but it is an orator's harmony; he alone has the harmony of poetry."

If these early phases of Chateaubriand seem immoderately dwelt upon, it should be recalled that from these youthful psychic travails his soul was actuated with the melancholy and intense poetic subjectivism which exhaled itself so unctiously in "René," "Atala," "Les Natchez" and those exquisite prose poems which gave him a world-wide reputation in literature and have exercised a notable influence on nearly every French writer of distinction who has come after him, even down to our own day.

Any engine whose force is beyond its own resistance is doomed to explosion. The human soul is not an exception. One almost marvels that Chateaubriand in his forty-fourth year, recalling this period of youthful hyperexaltation, should have chronicled the malign culmination of this soul-fever in the boy. He actually made an attempt upon his life! "I owned a fowling-piece whose worn

trigger often went off when uncocked. I loaded this gun with three bullets and went to a remote part of the Great Mall. I cocked the gun, placed the muzzle of the barrel in my mouth and struck the butt-end against the ground. I several times repeated the ordeal; the charge did not go off; the appearance of a keeper stopped my resolve."

It is not surprising to learn that the outcome of this high-tension period was a severe bodily illness, in which for six weeks his life lay in the balance. The physician prescribed a perfect change of life. The excellent advice which his mother gave to him at this crisis is admirable: "It is time for you to take a decision, but before going to the seminary you must take good counsel with yourself; for although I wish you to adopt the ecclesiastical state, I would rather see you a man of the world than a scandalous priest."

Happily, since he so clearly divined the lack of anything like a religious vocation in himself, Chateaubriand declared against the Church, as he had against the navy. Military service remained, and he loved a career in arms; but the thought of the discipline, the loss of his personal liberty, made him balk here. Only one who knows what it is to be possessed of an almost morbid sensitiveness to responsibility and consequences and endowed with an imagination and conscience which make the need of an all-important decision a soul-wracking torment can appreciate the trial all this proved to Chateaubriand. He declared he would go to Canada and clear forests, or to India and serve in the army of a native prince.

He was sent to Saint Malo, where an expedition to Pondicherry was fitting out. He found little in his birthplace to remind him of his childhood days. His old nurse, Villeneuve, had died in a room in which stood the little wicker go-cart in which he had learned to stand upright; the house of his birth had been converted into an inn; he met few that knew him. He strayed along the shore and headlands and waxed melancholy again, when a peremptory command recalled him to Combourg. His stern father declared he must put an end to his follies; that his brother had procured him a sub-lieutenant's commission in the Navarre Regiment. Then the severe, ailing, worn old man gave him his veteran sword and dismissed him with the words: "Conduct yourself as a good man and never disgrace your name." It was advice that Chateaubriand followed to his death. He embraced his father for the last time. He saw Combourg again, after his father's death, later, when he accompanied his mother there to arrange it for the arrival of his brother and his sister-in-law—the brother who never came. "He was soon, with his young wife, to receive at the hands of the execu-

tioner a different pillow from that prepared by my mother's hands." The last sight of Combourg was when he passed through it *en route* to Saint Malo, where he was to embark for America. "The castle was abandoned; I had to put up at the steward's lodge."

When he beheld the deserted steps, the closed windows, the empty house he fainted away. He left Combourg forever in the middle of the night.

His valedictory is exceedingly characteristic and touching. Fifteen years later, prior to his trip to the Holy Land, when he found himself in the neighborhood, he had not the courage to revisit it. "It is in the woods of Combourg that I became what I am, that I began to feel the attacks of weariness which I have dragged with me through life, of the sadness which has been my torment and my felicity. There I sought for a heart that could beat in touch with mine; there I saw my family united only to disperse. My father there dreamt of his name restored, of the fortunes of his house revived—another illusion which Time and the Revolutions have dispelled. Of six children that we were, we remain but three: my brother, Julie and Lucile are no more, my mother died of grief, my father's ashes were snatched from his grave."

Chateaubriand's oldest sister, the Comtesse de Marigny, lived to be one hundred and was the survivor of all the Combourg family circle. She died in 1860.

As Chateaubriand penned these lines it may well have occurred to him without undue pride that in him and through his individual merits the family name was destined to survive and become world-known beyond his haughty father's dreams. It is his merit that such a thought finds no expression here beyond this remark: "If my works survive me, if I am to leave a name behind me, perhaps one day, prompted by these 'Mémoires,' some traveler will come to visit the spots I have depicted." It is certain none who has read these eloquent personal revelations could visit Saint Malo or Combourg without sympathetic recollection of the unhappy genius whose name reflects glory upon them and drew in from them his first inspirations of glory and of melancholy.

This is the end of the Third Book. The next was written in Berlin in 1821, when Chateaubriand was fifty-three years of age, and revised twenty-five years later, two years before his death. It begins: "It is a far cry from Combourg to Berlin, from a young dreamer to an old Ambassador." Four years had elapsed between the writing of the Third and Fourth Books. "A thousand things have happened. A second man has shown himself in me, the politician. I care very little for him. I have defended the liberties of France, which alone can secure the duration of the lawful throne.

With the aid of the *Conservateur* I have set M. de Villèle in power; I have seen the Duc de Berry die and done honor to his memory. In order to reconcile everybody, I have gone away; I have accepted the Berlin Embassy."

Book Third showed the young Breton leaving Combourg for Paris. Aristocrat though he was, René was a rustic and a *gauche* young innocent when he made this first trip to the capital. His brother called for him on the evening he arrived and took him to their sister Julie, Madame de Farcy, who had been there some time to consult physicians. She was a *mondaine*, remarkably attractive, with quite a pretty talent for poetry, and when he saw her in Paris "she was set in all the luxurious pomp of worldliness. She appeared covered with those flowers, adorned with those necklaces, veiled in those scented fabrics which St. Clement forbids the early Christian women." Julie was fond of late evening parties, at which she recited "with marvelous euphony" her own verses. Her *type* was that of the three daughters of the Duc de Mortemart. Chateaubriand says Julie had more elegance than the most celebrated of them, Madame de Montespan, successor to poor Louise de La Vallière as the object of the *Grand Monarque's* favor. She received her *ingenu* brother with demonstrative affection, but when he got back to his little hotel he spent the night regretting the moors and trembling before his shadowy future.

Shortly after he joined his regiment at Cambrai, and then his father died. Soon after his brother, to further his own ambition, secured René's presentation at court, from which he shrank with all the aversion of his melancholy shyness, yet went. He saw the door of the King's bed chamber open and the King complete his toilet, *i. e.*, take his hat from the first lord in waiting. As he passed René on his way to Mass the Maréchal de Duras said: "Sire, the Chevalier de Chateaubriand." Louis XVI. paused, returned the new courtier's (?) bow, and thinking of nothing to say, passed on. The incident is interesting as Chateaubriand's first contact with those Bourbons toward whom he was to evince such fidelity from then on to the Comte de Chambord, whom he toiled to London to see when he was disabled with the infirmities of nigh four-score years, the aged subject posting laboriously to the monarch whom he had known as a little boy, with the fervor of his unalterable loyalty.

He was also favored with sight of Marie Antoinette, who was returning from chapel with a brilliant retinue. She made them a stately courtesy and seemed enraptured with life. "Those beautiful hands," comments Chateaubriand, "which at that time carried with such great grace the sceptre of so many Kings, were destined before

being bound by the executioner to mend the rags of the widow in the Conciergerie!" But the young Breton declined to remain and assist at the Queen's cards that night. Such was his presentation "at the first court in Europe, to make the most brilliant start in life." It was the forest wilds of America which were to supply that, and not the glittering glory of Versailles.

Humor plays small part in these "Mémoires." Their author's melancholy temperament, dissatisfaction and self-absorption allowed scant play for this peptic quality. When he describes an incongruity which appeals as the basis of such joyous effervescence, it is with no mirthful enjoyment in it. Irony or a sort of weary sarcasm supplies its place. The intractable Breton was not through with the court yet. The four *débutants* were to attend a royal hunt in the forest of Saint Germain, their mounts being supplied from the royal stables. The Duc de Coigny, the King's First Equerry, thoughtfully told the young men that they were not "to interrupt the hunt, as the King flew into a passion if any one passed between him and the quarry." L'Heureuse was the ill-discovered name of the skittish mare who fell to Chateaubriand. She refused to let him mount, and when he finally leaped upon her back she galloped wildly off and brought up against the horse of a fair equestrienne so violently that the animal was nearly bowled over. This was not enough. Half an hour later, at the sound of a shot, the mare again lowered her head and bore her powerless rider straight to the roebuck which had been killed, just as the King appeared, to find the *débutant* forestalling him at "the death." To the credit of Louis XIV., be it said, he only laughed heartily and exclaimed goodnaturedly: "He did not hold out long." It was a fit epitaph for Chateaubriand's first introduction to a court. As soon as the party returned to Versailles he bolted for Paris. He concludes this book with the words: "Good for everything where others, good for nothing where I myself am concerned; there you have me." The only joyful recollection he bore away from this brief court life was getting an idyll printed in the "Almanach des Muses." The author was already sprouting in him.

The beginnings of the different books are tid-bits. He says at the commencement of the next one: "I have returned to Paris for the christening of the Duke de Bordeaux" (Comte de Chambord, son of the Duke de Berry, who was son of Charles IX., brother of Louis XVI.), "and have resigned my embassy through political loyalty to M. de Villèle, who has left the Cabinet. Restored to leisure, let me write. The more these 'Mémoires' become filled with the years that have passed, the more do they remind me of the lower bulb of an hour-glass which marks what has fallen from

my life. When all the sand shall have passed through I would not turn over my glass clock if God gave me power to do so." Certainly, after what he went through in his eighty years, one may well fancy that he could quit life resignedly.

This book chronicles the most lurid page of his life—that fearful boiling over of French blood, the French Revolution. Chateaubriand was in Paris during the beginning of those stormy days, having gone there with his sisters Julie and Lucile. "It was the sweet partnership of the three youngest birds of the brood." His brother was married to the daughter of the President de Rosanto, granddaughter of Malesherbes, and they settled near him in the Faubourg St. Denis.

Chateaubriand met, for the first time, a man of letters, Delisle de Sales, and through him others: Guingené, Chamfort and M. de Fontanes, whom he came to know much more intimately in London, and who was an invaluable life-long friend to him in his writing. Through his brother they were thrown with another set concerned with politics and the troubled affairs of State. "At that time men's minds and manners were in every way unsettled, a symptom of a coming revolution. . . . The Revolution would have carried me away had it not started in crime. I saw the first head carried on the end of a pike, and I drew back. Murder will never to my eyes be an object of admiration or an argument in favor of liberty." His political education was beginning with visits to Brittany during 1787 and 1788. The Provincial States furnished the model of the States-General. Local troubles in Brittany and Dauphiné heralded those of the nation. He says: "The transformation that had been developing for two centuries was nearing its termination. France had passed from feudal monarchy to the monarchy of the States-General; from the monarchy of States-General to the monarchy of parliaments; from the monarchy of parliaments to that of absolute monarchy, and was now tending toward representative monarchy across the struggle between the magistracy and the royal power."

In 1788 Chateaubriand received the tonsure, merely as a condition to his entrance to the Order of Malta, as he might thus amass certain moneys from that source. It was his brother who persuaded him to this, "which has caused ill-informed biographers to state that I had at one time entered the Church." He did not return to Paris until after the opening of the States-General, the constitution of the Third Estate into a National Assembly, the oath of the Tennis Court, the royal speech of the 23d of June and the joining of the clergy and the nobles to the Commons.

Camille Desmoulins was coming to the front; the defection of

the army was commencing; Mirabeau was bullying the court; M. Necker was ordered to resign and Versailles was proportionately rejoiced. Chateaubriand took a young Breton visiting Paris out to Versailles and they saw Marie Antoinette with her beautiful children, Marie Therese of France, then eleven, and Louis, Duc de Normandie, the Dauphin, four years of age, under the proud little girl's protection. The tutor called the Queen's attention to Chateaubriand and she gave him a gracious bow and smile. "I shall never forget that look so soon to be extinguished. Marie Antoinette when she smiled outlined so clearly the shape of her mouth, that the recollection of that smile (O, horror!) enabled me to recognize the jaw bone of the daughter of Kings when the head of the unhappy woman was discovered in the exhumations of 1815."

On the 14th of July Chateaubriand was present at the fall of the Bastille, as a spectator of "this assault against a few pensioners and a timid governor; if the gates had been kept closed the mob could never have entered the fortress." "The keys of the Bastille multiplied; they were sent to all the important simpletons in the four quarters of the world. How often have I missed my fortune! If I, a spectator, had only inscribed my name on the list of the victors, I should be in receipt of a pension to-day." One of these keys of the Bastille is in Mount Vernon to-day.

There was a general dispersal of the courtiers after this to Bâle, Lausanne, Luxemburg and Brussels. The King's brother and his sons, the three Condés, emigrating, drew the higher clergy and nobility after them. The King and his family remained. Shortly after the 17th of July, when Louis XVI. affixed a tricolor rosette to his hat and the people saluted him as "Father of the French, King of a free people," Chateaubriand and his sisters were at the windows of their lodgings. A crowd of tatterdemalions came roaring down the street with two heads stuck on pikes, which they displayed triumphantly. They pushed the grisly things toward Chateaubriand's face. "'Brigands!' I cried, filled with indignation which I was unable to contain. 'Is that how you understand liberty?' Had I had a gun I should have fired at those wretches as at a pack of wolves. . . . These heads, and others which I saw soon afterwards, changed my political tendencies. I held the banquets of cannibals in abhorrence and the idea of leaving France for some distant country began to take root in my mind."

This testimony of Chateaubriand as to Louis XVI. at this time when he was engaged in Bourbon alliance with the Paris rabble is interesting: "Louis XVI. was not insincere; he was weak. Weakness is not an insincerity, but it takes its place and fulfills its functions. The respect with which the virtues and misfortunes of the

sainted and martyred King must needs inspire us render any expression of human judgment almost sacrilegious."

Chateaubriand confesses that "the Revolution would have carried me away had it not started in crime. The generous sentiments which were at the root of our earlier troubles appealed to the independence of my character; my natural antipathy to the court gave strength to this inclination. The severest blows struck against the ancient constitution of the State were delivered by noblemen. The patricians began the Revolution, the plebeians completed it. Just as old France owed her glory to the French nobility, even so does young France owe to it her liberty, if liberty there be for France." In 1831, in his "De la Restauration et de la Monarchie Elective," Chateaubriand declared: "I am a Bourbonist in honor, a Monarchist on grounds of national conviction; but in natural character and disposition I am still a Republican." At sixty-three years of age his opinions should have been settled.

Chateaubriand makes another observation which answers a doubt arising in many minds as they fain would picture what living in Paris meant when the Revolution was gathering to a head and still more when it broke into a cyclone of blood and disorder. He says: "When, before the Revolution, I read the history of public disturbances among various nations, I could not conceive how it was possible to live in these times. The Revolution made me understand the possibility of existence under such conditions. Moments of crisis produce a reduplication of life in men. Passions and characters, when at liberty, display themselves with an energy they do not possess in the well regulated State. . . . The Palace of the Tuileries, a great goal filled with sentenced prisoners, rose erect amid these festivals of destruction. . . . The year 1790 brought to completion the measures outlined by the year 1789. The property of the Church, first placed in the hands of the nation, was confiscated, the civil constitution of the clergy decreed, the nobility abolished."

At last even the Navarre Regiment felt insurrection in its ranks. Its officers emigrated. "I had neither adopted nor rejected the new opinions. I resigned my commission." His political impartiality pleased nobody. This apologetic (?) remark of his may not satisfy all: "I attached importance to the questions then raised only through general ideas concerning the liberty and dignity of the human race. Personal politics bored me; my real life lay in higher regions.

"One idea governed me, the idea of going to the United States. A useful object was wanting for my voyage. I proposed to discover the Northwest passage. I was at that time, like Bonaparte,

a slim sub-lieutenant, entirely unknown; both of us emerged from obscurity at the same period, I to seek renown in solitude, he to seek glory among mankind." M. de Malesherbes was a factor in stirring up this Polar ambition, declaring that if he were younger he would accompany Chateaubriand on the quest.

Things were getting worse for anybody with an "aristocratic" name in 1791, and this determined Chateaubriand. The Marquis de la Rouërie, who as "Colonel Armand" had distinguished himself in the American War of Independence, gave him a letter to Washington, and he selected Saint Malo as his port of embarkation that he might embrace his mother. After two months in his old birthplace he sailed in a craft whose port was Baltimore. The Abbé Nagot and several seminarists were his companions. The abbé established St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore in September, 1791. "These traveling companions would have been more to my liking four years earlier. From being a zealous Christian I had become 'a man of strong mind; in other words, a man of weak mind.'" He ascribes this change to reading philosophic works and fancying that religion paralyzed the mind! Perhaps the most potent agency was that which he mentions last—"the groundless despair I carried at the bottom of my heart."

At the beginning of the following book we have one of these graphic statements of striking contrasts. In this lengthy and minute revelation of his life Chateaubriand surely has the merit of candor and unreserve. He does not glaze over the things which reflect in his character; but, under the appearance of mere artistic appreciation of masked antitheses in his life, a whiff of past glory from his censer of memories is patently fragrant to his nostrils. Thus at the beginning of this book he says: "One-and-thirty years after embarking as a simple sub-lieutenant for America, I embarked for London with a passport conceived in these terms: 'Pass His Lordship, the Vicomte de Chateaubriand, Peer of France, Ambassador of the King to His Brittanic Majesty,' and so on.

"No description; my greatness was such as to make my face known wherever I went. A steamboat chartered for my sole use conveyed me from Calais to Dover." The next morning he posted to London in a carriage drawn by four horses driven at full trot by two smart postillions. The staff followed in other coaches, and couriers in his livery accompanied the party to the Embassy in Portland Place. He contrasts this pomp with his obscure landing at Southampton in 1793, when his passport was thus couched: "François de Chateaubriand, French officer in the emigrant army, five feet four inches high, thin shape, brown hair and whiskers." That certainly does not sound imposing. He was lodged then in

a garret in a little street off Tottenham Court Road, at $1.50 a week! He makes another reflection that is tinged with bitterness. "My political position casts into shade my literary fame; not a fool in the three kingdoms but prefers the Ambassador of Louis XVIII. to the author of the 'Genie du Christianisme.' I shall see how the matter turns after my death, or when I shall have ceased to fill M. le Duc Decazés' place at the Court of George IV., a succession as incongruous as the rest of my life." All this is characteristic and is only another form of worldly pride; but when he recalls the exile of the émigrés and of their mutual bond of sympathy in poverty and hardship it is a trifle forced to have him add: "All these things constitute true happiness!"

He sought escape from the melancholy engendered by his splendid environment in the Embassy to the less weighty melancholy of a walk in Kensington Gardens, where he would brood over those old days. Here occurs the first mention in his "Mémoires" of the woman who was to play such a long and dominant part in his sensitive, brooding life. "It is no longer even the fashion to meet there (Kensington Gardens) as in the days when the loveliest of Frenchwomen, Madame Récamier, used to walk there, followed by the crowd."

It was in these gardens he projected the "Essai Historique sur les Revolutions," his earliest publication; there, that in reading the diary of his travels in America, the romance of "Atala" came to his hand; there that he jotted down in pencil the first sketch of the passions of "René."

Fortunately the Embassy afforded ample leisure for the "Mémoires." "So many hours are wasted in Embassies! . , . My secretaries ask leave to go to picnics in the morning, to balls at night; by all means! The men in their turn, Peter, Valentine, Lewis, go to the ale-house, and the maids, Rose, Peggy, Mary, for a walk through the streets. They leave me the key of the hall door; *Monsieur l'Ambassadeur* is left in charge of his own house; if any one knocks he will open the door. I am alone; let us get to work. . . . The Ambassador of the King of France will be able to tell the story of the French Emigrant in the very spot where the latter spent his exile."

All this is very effective. Like his great friend, Mme. Récamier, the force and fascination of his personality lay in his personal lure. Chateaubriand and Napoleon were both noted for a smile whose charm was irresistibly captivating. Saint Beuve while admitting this in Chateaubriand, significantly adds: "But he was not always smiling." None could suspect the writer of these "Mémoires" of that.

Chateaubriand's voyage took nearly two months. Two days before arriving in American waters he was nearly drowned while taking a swim in the sea on a terribly warm day. The evening after they steered into Chesapeake Bay a boat was sent on shore for provisions. Chateaubriand went, and as he stood on American soil indulged in a surging swell of emotions. They found a farm-house, and the first soul they met was a young Negress. "I gave my silk handkerchief to the little African; a slave welcomed me to the soil of liberty." Baltimore was "a pretty little Catholic town, neat and lively." He gave a dinner to the captain, and went on to Philadelphia in the stage, which ran there every three weeks, starting at four in the morning. Philadelphia struck him as " a fine town with wide streets, which had not yet (1791) spread as far as the Schuylkill." "Philadelphia presents a monotonous aspect." He was somewhat surprised to find luxury, frivolity, inequality of fortunes and gambling, theatres and balls in the infant Republic.

George Washington was not in Philadelphia, and he was obliged to wait a week for him. When he saw him go past in a carriage drawn by four horses, this scandalized him a little, for he was thinking of the American leader as he did of Cincinnatus and his plough. But Washington's "small house, like its neighbors, no sentries, nó footmen even," was simple enough to satisfy him. A maid came to the door. He presented his letter, was asked in and sat down while she went to call Washington. "I felt no agitation; greatness of mind or fortune in no way overawe me.

"After a few moments the general entered the room; tall in stature, of a calm and cold rather than a noble bearing, he resembled his engraved portraits." Chateaubriand handed the letter in silence. They sat down then and the young Breton explained that he had come over to discover the Northwest passage. Washington naturally betrayed some astonishment at the placid assurance of this slender, undersized Breton of twenty-three. "I remarked this and said to him, with some little animation: 'But it is less difficult to discover the Northwest passage than to create a people, as you have done.' "

This amazingly youthful remark did not elicit the caustic rejoinder it might well have called forth. Washington simply said: "Well, well, young man!" shook hands and invited Chateaubriand to dinner. There were only five or six guests, but their names are not mentioned. "The general showed us a key from the Bastille. These keys were rather silly toys which passed from hand to hand at that time. . . . If Washington had seen the 'victors of the Bastille' disporting themselves in the gutters of Paris he would have felt less respect for his relic. The seriousness and strength

of the Revolution did not spring from these blood-stained orgies. At the time of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, in 1685, the same mob from the Faubourg Saint Antoine demolished the Protestant temple at Charanton with as much ardor as when it laid waste the Church of Saint Denis, in 1793." This "Key of the Bastille" is solemnly conserved at Mount Vernon to-day.

Here occurs one of those interesting digressions in the "Mémoires" which yet have a logical reason. Chateaubriand wrote this portion of his life at the Embassy in London in the months between April and September, 1822. Napoleon had died at St. Helena the spring of the preceding year. So that when he writes about Washington, whom he had met thirty-one years ago, the thought of Bonaparte, whom he had known so much better and whose inglorious death had occurred so recently, arose and he makes a fine comparison between the two men, just, acute and impartial. The reason he gives for doing this here instead of waiting until he gets to Bonaparte's death in the "Mémoires" is very naïf. "Should I happen to sink into the grave before reaching the year 1814 (Napoleon's abdication) in my chronicle, the reader would never know what I had to say on the subject of the two mandatories of Providence." He recalls Castelnau's Memoirs, a French Ambassador to England, like himself. "On the last page of Book VII. he says to his son: 'I will treat of this fact in the eighth book,' and the eighth book of Castelnau's Memoirs does not exist. That is a warning to me to take advantage of life while it lasts."

All this is *seriously* said and written, which proves how scant was his sense of humor and how seriously he took himself; nay, prized himself, despite frequent self-depreciations. The substance of the comparison is that Washington was not such a great man as Bonaparte, but that he was far nobler and did incomparably more good to mankind, which is beyond question.

"Washington's Republic is in existence; Bonaparte's Empire is destroyed. Washington and Bonaparte issued from the bosom of democracy; both were born of liberty; the first was faithful to her, the second betrayed her." Chateaubriand's eloquence, clearness and cogency are well evidenced in these simple but clever appreciations, which are too long to be quoted.

But he was eager to get on—to discover his Northwest passages. As he says: "I burned to throw myself into an enterprise for which I had nothing prepared except my imagination and my courage." He then blandly sets down his route. "I proposed to strike the Northwest coast above the Gulf of California; from there, *following the outline of the continent and always keeping the sea in sight,* I intended to explore Behring's Straits, double the northernmost cape of America, descend on the east *along the shores of the*

Arctic Ocean and return to the United States by way of Hudson's Bay, Labrador and Canada." There is in all this the artlessness of an imaginative child making voyages of discovery in the nursery. "What means had I to carry out this prodigious peregrination?" Chateaubriand asks, and frankly replies: "None at all." No wonder Washington had contented himself with his "Well, well, young man."

He sails up the Hudson to Albany to see a Mr. Swift, for whom he had been given a letter. Mr. Swift was a trader in furs and had enough sense (it required only a modicum!) to intimate to the young man the physical impossibilities of his wild plan. He suggested that he should begin by acclimatizing himself; that he should learn the Sioux, Iroquois and Esquimaux languages, live among the *coureurs des bois* and Hudson Bay Company agents, and thought, with this preliminary experience, he might, in four or five years, with the assistance of the French Government, proceed on his hazardous mission.

Chateaubriand was "annoyed" by the advice, though he perceived its reasonableness. That he should have felt thus and confess it with perfect composure is quite characteristic. He secured a guide, bought two horses and set out for Niagara and Pittsburg, intending then to go down the Ohio and "gather ideas for future plans." He soon saw his first savages. When one recalls his "Natchez," "René" and "Atala," it seems too absurd that this maiden vision of these children of nature should have shown them taking dancing lessons of a little powdered Frenchman in an apple-green coat, who had been General Rochambeau's scullion!

As he describes woodland things and the emotions he experiences one does not need his assurance that "during those nights an unknown muse appeared to me." Especially when, through the stillness of the virgin forest rumbled the solemn roar of Niagara's distant waters. He got his first glimpse of the Falls from above them. In the "Essai sur les Révolutions" and "Atala" are to be found descriptions of the scene. He was poet enough and sufficiently a child of nature to drink in the spectacle with throbbing delight. He is also filled with the thought of the French who had penetrated to these wilds, and exclaims: "The whole genius of France lies in the double army of our camps and of our altars." Chateaubriand nearly fell into the cataract, and his account of this smacks not a little of Munchausen. He fell forty feet, but "by an unparalleled stroke of good fortune I found myself upon the pointed back of a rock upon which I ought to have been smashed into a thousand pieces. And yet I felt no great hurt." He later dis-

covered that his left arm was broken above the elbow. Even this was getting off easily. In the meantime the lure of the wild woodland trail was such that he scarcely gave further thought to his designs on the Polar regions. Instead—*les extremes se touchant*—he joined a party of traders going to the Floridas.

Chateaubriand here conceived a romantic *tendresse* for two beautiful young Indian women. They were at least useful in supplying him with the ideals of Atala and Celuta. They are carried off by a "Burnt-Wood" and a Seminole, who were jealous of the fascinating little Frenchman. One has the feeling that Chateaubriand is very young and more intoxicated by his own poetic tides than he is the victim of passion, as he would seem to insinuate in his narration of this episode. But he hies back to beyond the Blue Mountains. There at a farm-house he chanced to read in an English newspaper lying crumpled on the floor the words "Flight of the King."

Again an instantly conceived impulse crystallized the dreamy, drifting Breton into action quite alien to that upon which he had embarked. "I abruptly interrupted my travels and said to myself, 'Go back to France.'"

Some of the reflections which Chateaubriand then proceeds to make on the United States are remarkable for their justice and insight. What he said over eighty years ago is even truer to-day in application. He coined a word to express the sort of aristocracy he felt would rise in this infant nation whose corner-stone was man's equality. Every one to-day must recognize its exquisite but bold adequacy of characterization. It was "gold-born." "A *chrysogenous* aristocracy is ready to appear with the love of distinctions and the passion for titles." A "gold-made" "best-people." It is a paradox, but a truth.

When he got back to Philadelphia he was disappointed not to find the remittances he expected. "This was the commencement of the pecuniary difficulties in which I have been plunged ever since," writes France's Embassador to England. He embarked December 10, 1791, for Havre, voyaging on credit. They were nearly shipwrecked, but escaped the peril with a cheer and a shout of "Long live the King!" "God did not hear it for Louis XVI.; it benefitted none save ourselves. . . . On the 2d of January, 1792, I once more trod my native soil, which was soon again to slip from under my feet. I brought with me no Esquimaux from the Polar regions, but two savages of an unknown species: Chactas and Atala." Happily! His Esquimaux he could not have shared with the world with such profit to himself and delight for mankind.

This is the end of the first of the six volumes. None of the others is comparable to it in biographical interest. In its unique pages the reader sees the making of a human character, disclosed by the man himself. Shelley said that "no matter how long a man lives, the first twenty years of his life are the longer half." Saint Malo, with its breezy, cheery seaport setting for a neglected little boy; Combourg, with its depressing solitude, sombre life and heart famine; the dissatisfied sortie to Parisian existence; the gathering gloom and disintegration of the dissolving French society, the ebullition of the people and the crumbling of thrones; the wild, poetic region of the new Republic of the virgin Western world—all these in turn sank into, modified and gave idiosyncrasy to the soul of Chateaubriand as did no other influences throughout the threescore remaining years of his life. Not a breath of fame had touched him as yet. But the germs of the writer were already springing up in his being, ready to tremble into leaf and flower, and it is his writings that have made Chateaubriand known to the world, their influence and beauty which have perpetuated his name. He has scare begun his life as yet, despite the French Revolution and the voyage to America. He has not found himself, but destiny is moulding him for his *mètier*. The charm of this stage of his career and the melancholy sweetness of his reflections upon life surpass all that is to follow. The exquisite friendship with Madame Récamier is to crown his last years with a glorious, poetic light as of the sunset; but those who are not subjugated by the Réne of this first volume are little likely to feel their sympathies go out to him more readily through events of his later career, far more important in themselves, but not comparable in their narration as affects to the personal and touching charm exhaled by his unsettled, panting and yearning spirit as boy and young man.

It is for this reason that they have been drawn on so amply. The reader already knows the real Chateaubriand. In substance, what he is as a young man he persists in being to the end. The other five books deal with trials, triumphs—literary, political and social—close connection with crises in French history and the principal actors in them, and lastly retirement not unaccompanied by soothing influences. But the René that has been bodied forth already, sensitive, a spiritual epicure, a gentle egoist, a delicate poet, an aristocrat by blood, a brother of humanity through his love of liberty and independence, an embodiment of loyalty to the Bourbons, a man whose passion was spiritualized and in whom sentiment reached its apogee, a genius, charged with melancholy from his birth, the prandiose, varied, vitally interesting panorama of whose life, projected by himself, is dated from "Beyond the Tomb." This

is Chateaubriand. The rest is but history affecting him. But those vicissitudes were extraordinary and move to wonder or to sympathy, while their novelty, dignity and brilliancy delight.

JOHN J. A'BECKET.

New York.

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH.

PUBLIC attention has of late been directed to Armenia on account of the fearful massacres of the Christian population in the close of the last century. We have seen members of a Christian nation of the same Aryan blood as ourselves suffering the most cruel wrongs at the hands of the Turks and their confederates, the Kurds, and dying a martyr's death rather than embrace the creed of Islam. At this juncture it may not be inopportune to inquire into the history of the Catholic Church in Armenia, and more particularly to acquaint ourselves with the circumstances attending the conversion of that country to Christianity, the foundation and growth of the Church and her status up to the time of the separation at the end of the fifth century. Previous to that unhappy schism, the history is one of which her children may well be proud; founded in apostolic times, her traditions reach back to the earliest ages of Christianity, while her martyrology will bear comparison with that of almost any church in the West. It was, moreover, in Armenia that Christianity first became a State religion.

While great peoples have vanished from the face of the earth, the Armenian nation has not only continued to exist, but has maintained its individuality from the days of Nimrod and Semiramis up to our own times, and in a great measure has preserved its distinctive features, its customs, language and religion in spite of the fact that no nation, not even excepting the Hebrew, has been called to endure such sufferings. From time immemorial the Armenians have dwelt in the fertile and mountainous country which Holy Scripture describes as the cradle of the human race after the deluge; they assert that their tongue is the oldest in the world, being that spoken by Noe and his descendants when they emerged from the ark and settled in the province of Ararat, the land lying between Asia Minor and the Caspian Sea. Aram, the sixth descendant of Haik, the grandson of Japhet, of whom tradition speaks as a hero and a monarch, gave his name to the land. Ararat is the Hebrew name employed in Holy Scripture for the whole of Armenia (Jer. li., 27.) The inhabitants were an industrious race, workers in metal. Xeno-

phon speaks of them as being in his time self-governed and free, holding polytheistic beliefs. The earliest chroniclers and Christian writers state that they once professed the true, monotheistic, pre-Christian religion of the Jews, but through the cultus of their ancestors and intercourse with neighboring heathen nations they became idolators and set up golden statues of their gods. This led to moral degeneracy, pride, cruelty, intemperance; voluptuousness became characteristics of the nation, vices strongly opposed to the reception of Christianity.

At the time of our Lord's birth Armenia was divided into two separate portions, called respectively Great and Lesser Armenia. Of the latter portion Abgar was king, or rather Roman deputy, as the Roman Government claimed suzerainty over the land, conquered in 69 B. C., in which he held sway. Abgar, being devoted to the service of the heathen deities, refused to permit the image of Augustus to be erected in the temples of his dominions. Being accused of disloyalty, and offended by the treatment his ambassadors received at Rome, he determined to revolt, and removed the seat of his government to Edessa. Just then the Parthian king died and Abgar marched into Persia to restore order. This expedition was overruled by Providence for the conversion of the monarch and the opening out of Armenia and Parthia to the light of the Gospel. Hearing that the Roman general Marinus was at Cæsarea with a large army, Abgar sent an embassy to him to prevent a breach between himself and the Emperor. While in Palestine his emissaries heard of the fame of Jesus of Nazareth, and, tradition states, were eye witnesses of some of His miracles. On their return they informed the king, who was stricken with a terrible malady, probably leprosy, which the court physicians could not cure, of the healing power possessed by the Jewish wonder-worker.

The whole world, as Suetonius and Tacitus inform us, was at that period anxiously expecting the Messiah, a statement corroborated by the pilgrimage of the Persian Magi to Jerusalem. Abgar, believing that the great prophet, the desire of the nations, had come, was desirous to profit by his miraculous power and sent messengers, bearing, some say, a letter from the king, to request Jesus to come and heal him. With them he sent a portrait painter, who, if the Saviour Himself would not come, should bring His likeness. They reached Jerusalem on the day of our Lord's triumphal entry, and being unable to approach Him, requested Philip to deliver the letter and procure for them an audience. This, we are told, is the meaning of the incident recorded in St. John's Gospel, ch. xii., vs. 20-24, the word Gentiles being used in the New Testament for all who were not Jews. Christ, seeing in them representatives of the heathen

world, predicted that His crucifixion would draw all things to Him (v. 32). Moses of Chorene, the oldest Armenian chronicler, mentions as an undisputed fact that our Lord sent a message, written or verbal, to Abgar, declaring him blessed for believing in Him, not having seen, and promising when taken up into heaven to send one of His disciples to Armenia to heal the king and preach the Gospel. A legendary account, which must be taken for what it is worth, states that the painter, failing to portray our Lord's countenance, Christ took a cloth and applied it to His face, the impression of His sacred features remaining imprinted on it. But whatever may be legendary, there is no reason to doubt the fact that in the first century Thaddeus, one of the twelve Apostles, made his way to Armenia, healed the king, baptized many, erected a church in Edessa, and was put to death by Abgar's son and successor, Sanatruk. Miracles were wrought at the martyr's tomb, which led to the conversion of a large number of persons. SS. Simon and Jude, the Apostles of Persia, are also mentioned in connection with Armenia, and Bartholemew, one of the seventy, is said to have accompanied Thaddeus. Sanatruk, himself an apostate from the Christian faith, restored the worship of the heathen gods and persecuted the converts cruelly, cutting off the feet of Zacharias, the Bishop appointed by Thaddeus as his successor. The probable reason of the persecution was that he owed his crown to the Romans, and at that period the Christians were persecuted in all the Roman dominions by command of the Emperor.

Doubtless, as has already been stated, at a remote period Jewish colonists in Armenia had prepared the way for the acceptation of the faith of which their creed contained the promise, for the number of converts increased so much in the reigns of succeeding non-Christian monarchs that the heathen temples were almost abandoned. Pliny the younger, writing to Trajan, says: "The pestilence of this superstition has not only invaded the towns, but infected the villages and spread over all the land." About the middle of the third century, through the influence of the Persians, which for about a quarter of a century in great measure superseded that of the Romans, with whom constant war was waged, Chrosov I. was placed on the throne; at that time the Christians had multiplied to such an extent that they were thought to endanger the religion of the State, and a general massacre ensued. Shortly after Chrosov, during an incursion into Persia, was treacherously murdered. With his last breath he commanded his officers to extirpate the family of his assassin, whose every child and relative was put to death, with the exception of one son, the youngest, who owed his rescue to his nurse, Sophia, and her brother, both Christians. This child, carried

by them to Cæsarea, became the greatest figure in Armenian history, St. Gregory the Illuminator, the Apostle of Armenia.

Chrosov's son, Tiridates, escaped out of the hands of Ardashir, king of Persia, and fled to Rome, where he was educated. When he was of age, the Romans, anxious for the sake of commercial interests not to lose their supremacy over Armenia, supplied Tiridates with a large army, wherewith he returned to his native land and regained the crown to which he was heir, being hailed by his countrymen as their deliverer from the Persian yoke (A. D. 284). Meanwhile Gregory had grown up in Cæsarea, where he was thoroughly instructed in the Greek and Syriac languages. Hearing that Tiridates had ascended the throne, he returned to the court and entered his service, hoping by faithful and devoted labor to atone to Chrosov's son for the crime his own father, Anak, had committed. Tiridates had learned in Rome to hate the name of Christian, and when he endeavored by entreaties and threats to induce Gregory to worship his gods, and found that he persisted in fidelity to Christ, he caused him to be cruelly tortured, bound and finally cast into an oubliette of immense depth below the castle of Ardashat, the living tomb of all criminals sentenced to death. It is said that on his way to this subterranean dungeon he healed thirty sick Christians who were placed in his path. Left in this awful place to die, Gregory was kept alive for the space of fifteen years by the compassion of a Christian widow who dwelt in the castle. Admonished by a celestial messenger, every day she baked a small cake of bread and lowered it into the dungeon where he was confined.

As the years went by Gregory was forgotten at court. Now it happened that Diocletian, desirous of obtaining a beautiful damsel for himself, was shown the portrait of Rhipsime, a maiden of noble family, famed for her extraordinary beauty, the work of an artist who, anxious to obtain the Emperor's favor, penetrated into the nunnery where she dwelt. Diocletian sent to take her by force, but Rhipsime, aware of his intention and jealous of her vows, had already fled from Rome with all her companions. Amid great hardships they made their way through Palestine and came to Armenia, where they took refuge in a cave. It is said that the Blessed Virgin appeared to Rhipsime and directed her steps thither. The Roman Emperor sent messengers in pursuit of her; the hiding-place of the community was discovered, but Tiridates, struck by her charms, instead of giving her up in obedience to the imperial behest, resolved himself to make her his wife. However, she successfully resisted his attempt to make her false to her vow, and the monarch, enraged at his defeat, caused her to be put to a horrible death, and her thirty-two companions as well. God's judgment fell upon Tiri-

dates; he became insane, his madness taking the form of lycanthropy, as was the case with Nebuchodonosor many years before him. He imagined himself a wild boar, and fled to the thickets, where he tore off his garments; his body became covered with bristles, his teeth resembled tusks, his face was elongated into a snout. His subjects, appalled at his awful condition, knew not how to deliver him from it; when his sister, Chassoviducht, had a vision, in which it was revealed to her that Gregory was still alive ,and he alone could cure the unhappy monarch. Her assertion was at first treated with contempt, as more than thirteen years had elapsed since the confessor had been consigned to the subterranean dungeon, but on a repetition of the vision messengers were sent thither, who, in fact, found Gregory to be living, in a most pitiable condition, but mentally uninjured. By virtue of his prayers Tiridates was completely cured and restored to his former appearance. In reparation of his crime he caused the relics of the virgin-martyrs to be recovered and erected a costly chapel over the place of their sepulture.

Then Gregory began to preach the faith of Christ to king and people. They heard him gladly; Tiridates, not content with accepting personally the message of salvation, determined to establish the Christian religion in his dominions. The heathen temples were pulled down, the pagan worship was abolished. But Gregory was not a priest. As a layman he had not power to receive converts into the Church, much less to dispense the sacrament. All that he could do was to erect the cross on the site where the temples had stood. By the desire of the king and nobles he went to Cæsarea, where he received Holy Orders and episcopal consecration from Leontius, the Archbishop. At the request of the king he was nominated by the Episcopal Synod Metropolitan of Armenia, whither he returned, with relics of St. John the Baptist for the church he intended to build. On his way he stopped at Sebaste to solicit a band of monks to accompany him and aid him in the evangelization of the land. Tiridates went to meet him with a numerous retinue, and was, together with a large number of people, baptized in the River Euphrates. The title of the "Armenian Constantine" is given to this monarch, since by him Christianity, formerly the creed of a persecuted and despised minority, became the religion of the State, officially recognized as such. (295 A. D.)

The national literature of Armenia, as well as the writings of ecclesiastical historians in the West, speaks of the wonderful conversion of the land by the missionary activity of St. Gregory, surnamed the Illuminator. By him the Church in Armenia was not only founded, but organized and consolidated to secure its maintenance in a land where it would have to contend with heathen

fellow countrymen and Persian conquerors. He consecrated several bishops and ordained a great number of priests and deacons, introduced monasticision, founding many convents, which in great measure were filled with monks from Greece and Syria, who were acquainted with Armenian customs and the Armenian tongue, having been driven into exile in times of persecution. He took his seat on the throne of the patriarchate of Armenia in 302, and for thirty years he continued to preach, administer the sacraments, build churches and schools, serve the poor and ransom prisoners. All this he did not accomplish without violent opposition; military force had often to be employed to overthrow the pagan temples, and the Christian churches had to be protected by a surrounding wall. To ensure independence of action in ecclesiastical matters and the exercise of his ministerial functions, he would not have his episcopal seat in the city where the king had his court. In all things pertaining to faith or discipline he acknowledged the supreme authority of the Holy See, though the Syrian liturgy was in use, because the population of the southeastern districts were almost exclusively Syrian. The fact that Armenian bishops took part in the Council of Nicea proves that in Gregory's time the unity of the universal Church was recognized, and all idea of a national Church excluded. Gregory was himself a scion of a royal race; thus to the rank of the Christian high-priest he combined that of royal birth, and was in possession of considerable wealth. Towards the close of his life he withdrew into retirement and seclusion, although he retained the supervision of the Church. Whilst a youth in Cæsarea he had married a Christian maiden; after three years of wedded life they parted by mutual consent. Two sons were born to him; the younger, Arisdaghes, from his childhood embraced a life of solitude and austerity; he was ordained and consecrated bishop and succeeded his father as patriarch.

The testimony of ecclesiastical historians affords incontestable evidence that in Gregory's time all the articles of the Christian faith were taught and believed in Armenia in their integrity, and the sacraments administered conformably to the Church's rules. Baptism by immersion was administered to adults at Easter, after a preparatory season of fasting and penance, and confirmation immediately after baptism, according to the custom in early ages. Christian views and rules concerning matrimony prevailed, as is shown by the hatred evinced by polygamists and concubines towards Christianity. The celibacy of priests was not enforced, except in the case of monks; bishops were not allowed to marry, but a union previously contracted was not regarded as a bar to consecration. The liturgy, which is said to date from the first century, being

founded on that of Jerusalem, was remodeled by St. Gregory, who introduced into it the Nicene Creed, to which he added the following words, which are still said at the end of the Creed in Armenian churches: "Now let us praise Him who was before all worlds, worshiping the Most Holy Trinity and the Godhead of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, now and forever, world without end. Amen."

The peaceful conditions of the Church in Armenia under the rule of Tiridates, the first Christian monarch, who established the Christian religion throughout his dominions, ceased shortly after his death in 329. The bond between Church and State was an external one and the conversion of many persons was superficial and time-serving. Before long in some more remote districts not only were Jewish traditions and customs revived, but either overtly or covertly the cultus of the national deities and heathen practices were restored. Arisdaghes, murdered by order of a prince whose un-Christian life he had rebuked, was succeeded by his elder brother Urthanes as Catholicos,* who, in his turn, fell into disgrace for admonishing the king to observe and enforce the Christian laws. Like St. Ambrose, he forbade the king to enter the house of God on a solemn occasion; and the king, not resembling Theodosius in humility, caused the prelate to be beaten so severely as to occasion his death. The amicable political relations with Rome and Persia also came to an end, and amid internal factions and external strife the Church passed through many vicissitudes and crises, until, about the middle of the fourth century, Nerses, afterwards called The Great, was raised to the chief patriarchate. A descendant of St. Gregory, he had been brought up in Cæsarea and there had married. On the death of his wife he returned to Armenia and was universally chosen by the nation for their metropolitan. He entered the priesthood and was consecrated the next year. By his zeal, energy and activity he introduced reforms, inaugurated seminaries for the training of the clergy, provided hospitals for the sick and aged and raised the tone of Christian life in general. He was greatly beloved, but at last a breach occurred between him and Arshak, the king, because he was obliged to leave the court on account of the king's misdeeds. Banished to Edessa, he remained in exile for nine years, during which a bloody persecution took place. The destruction of the Greek manuscripts which were the spiritual nourishment of the Armenian Christians was a serious loss at this time. Many instances

* The term and title Catholicos is of Greek origin. In the Eastern Church it was given to Bishops sent outside the boundaries of the Roman Empire with full hierarchical powers over their flocks, yet subject to the authority of the prelate by whom they were consecrated.

of heroic fortitude and attachment to the faith were given by those who refused to conform to the Persian worship of fire and water. When the king had thrown off the Persian yoke, Nerses returned to his flock; the churches destroyed during the Persian invasion were rebuilt and their altars to the sun overthrown. But Nerses, venturing to reprove the king for his licentious life, was enticed to the palace under pretext of the monarch doing penance and was given a cup of poisoned wine at the royal table.

A period of storm and stress for the Church ensued. The charitable institutions Nerses had founded were suppressed, the convents violated and their inmates maltreated or compelled to marry, divorce and the marriage of divorced persons was permitted, the clergy were in a great measure robbed of their property. It was during these troublous times that S. Basil visited Armenia and restored order to the hierarchy and fortified the faith of the Christians. The Armenian Church was strong enough to weather the storm and render her independent of the royal authority. Her history in the fourth century affords an example of the interior vitality possessed by the Church of Christ, which, though always oppressed, is never suppressed. Yet, despite their general adherence to tradition and ecclesiastical authority, some of the faithful in Armenia were infected by Arianism, owing to the favor of the king showed for that heresy. It is related that a certain monk, a disciple of Epiphanius, never received the chalice (communion was then administered in both kinds) because he could not bring himself to believe that the wine was really converted into the precious blood of Christ. He openly contested the Church's doctrine, but was converted by a miracle. Whilst assisting at Mass, just as the priest offered a prayer that the unbelieving brother might have grace to believe, he beheld our Lord Himself above the altar, who showed him His side, whence drops of blood flowed into the chalice. The monk's unbelief vanished; in penance for his sin for seven years he abstained from receiving Holy Communion and lived in solitude in a cave. This anecdote is of value, inasmuch as it shows the belief in our Lord's presence under the Eucharistic veils to have been universal in Armenia. Other evidence to the same effect is not wanting.

At the close of the fourth century Armenia was divided between the Greeks and the Persians and the Church lived under foreign rule. The Persians, for the tranquillity of the nation, gave them a king of their own royal race, Artasher. He was the last of the Arsacide dynasty who sat on the throne; after his death, in 428, Persian governors ruled the land, and Armenia had to struggle for religious freedom, for the life of Christianity amongst the people.

At this time a man of energy and ability filled the post of Catholicos, Sahak (Isaac), the son of Nerses the Great. Individual bishops had been originally appointed by Gregory; subsequently it became customary for sons, born before their father's ordination, to succeed him in his spiritual office, as they succeeded to his property. Thus practiaclly ecclesiastical dignities became hereditary, but not positively, as the metropolitan was empowered to reject candidates for ordination, or bishops elect who went to Cæsarea for examination and consecration. Isaac was about forty when he was raised to the rank of chief bishop, and though married previously, from that time forth he lived a strict monastic life. He gave a fresh impulse to religious life in Armenia, and to the spiritual blessings owed to him, a great advance in intellectual culture was added. The prohibition issued by the Persian governor in regard to the use of Greek harps and the study of Greek literature in Armenia, owing to the rivalry between the two nations, was a severe blow to the Church, since they only possessed the Holy Scriptures in Greek, and in that language or in Syriac, they were read in the churches. Until the time of which we speak, Armenia possessed no national characters for the purpose of writing. The Greek, Syriac or Persian alphabet was used, all of which were quite insufficient to give the Armenian pronunciation correctly. Isaac resolved to supply the want. He induced Mesrop, a man famed for erudition and sanctity, well versed in literature, who had spent the early portion of his life as secretary to the patriarch Nerses, to invent an alphabet suited to the genius of the language. A pious Syrian bishop, named Daniel, had by him an alphabet formed for the purpose of writing in Armenian; this was sent to Mesrop, who found on studying it that fourteen more letters were needed to express the sounds of his native tongue. He improved, arranged and added to it, and from that time forth it has been in use in Armenia. Immediately upon the formation of a script, Isaac and Mesrop sent disciples to Alexandria, Byzantium, Athens and other cities to learn the language and translate the Christian literature into their own tongue. First and foremost were the Holy Scriptures, the different books being, by the counsel of St. Chrysostum, assigned to the several translators. Next came ecclesiastical writings; the canons of the various Councils, treatises explanatory of the Bible, theological and scientific works. Moreover, Isaac summoned a synod of the bishops and clergy to confer upon the adoption of the Armenian language and the newly-invented script for the liturgy, which, since the prohibition of the use of Greek, had been solemnized in Syriac. It was decreed that it should be translated into the vernacular and revised for the better comprehension by the people. Isaac himself jour-

neyed into the Greco-Armenian portion of his diocese to prepare translations and to introduce the new alphabet to his countrymen in that district. In this he was, however, opposed by the Archbishop of Cæsarea, as that realm was under his jurisdiction. Isaac appealed to Theodosius, who issued an imperial edict to the effect that the metropolitan was not to be hindered in his work, that he was to receive the same honor as the Archbishop of Cæsarea and that the expense of teaching the Armenian students the use of the new script was to be defrayed from the imperial exchequer.

Before long, however, this prelate, who had done so much for the intellectual development and religious growth of his country, who had infused fresh life into the Church and rekindled the national spirit, was obliged to abandon his cathedral seat and wander about in exile, the victim of his patriotism. The Persian Satrap had determined upon the abolishment of royal rule in Armenia, and the Catholicos, who thought a professing Christian king, though his life was vicious, preferable to a heathen governor, had to be removed before the throne of the Arsacide dynasty could be finally overthrown and the ocuntry brought under the galling yoke of the Sassanidæ, the relentless enemies of the Christian faith. After a time he was permitted to return, but not reinstated in the post he had filled so ably. He continued his literary work up to the time of his death, in 441. A monastery was erected on the spot where he was interred; it became a place of pilgrimage, several miracles having been wrought there. Mesrop, his co-laborator, did not long survive him.

Hardly had the Persians established their rule in Armenia when they raised a cruel persecution against the Christians, many of whom displayed great heroism in shedding their blood for their faith. Amongst its brave defenders, Joseph I., Isaac's successor, greatly distinguished himself. He repaired to the camp of those who had deemed revolt indispensable for the maintenance of Christianity; divine worship was held in the early hours before battle, and the warriors received the sacraments before engaging in the conflict. This war of independence, national and religious, lasted long; finally the insurgents laid down their arms on condition that the free exercise of their religion should be granted them and the Armenian Christians should enjoy equal rights and privileges with the Persians. The temples of the fire-worshipers were overthrown and the cross once more shone brightly in the land illumined by Gregory. Divine Providence guided and protected the Church during those stormy and perilous years of struggle; though many fell away for the sake of temporal advantage, or conformed externally to the Persian cultus through human respect, yet Christianity

lived and retained strength for final victory owing to the zeal and example of its pastors, the disciples of Isaac, who maintained the spirit and teaching of their master.

The union of the Armenian Church with the rest of Christendom, her recognition of the supremacy of the See of Rome and of the authority of the Œcumenical Councils, the oneness of her belief with those of the Universal Church and the unbroken continuity of her hierarchical connection with the see of Cæsarea up to the close of the fifth century, are an indisputable fact, confirmed by the testimony of contemporary historians and the pastoral letters, still extant, of her bishops. The calamities of which we have just been speaking, in the latter half of the fifth century, prevented the Armenian bishops from taking part in the fourth Œcumenical Council, that of Chalcedon (as they had in the three preceding ones), and thence arose the unhappy rupture between Armenia and the Eastern Church at the close of that century.

The Council of Chalcedon condemned the heresy of Eutyches, who, whilst combating the erroneous teaching of Nestorius, fell into another heresy and denied the two natures in Christ. A report was spread by the followers of Eutyches in Armenia, which had unhesitatingly accepted and faithfully adhered to the decisions of the three previous councils, that the Council of Chalcedon had approved the doctrine of Nestorius. This false report was confirmed by the Byzantine Emperor with a view to allaying the religious disturbances. A somewhat ambiguous letter to this purport from the Emperor Zeno was introduced into Armenia and read before a large assembly of bishops in the cathedral. After anathematizing the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches, they assented to the letter, and formally rejected the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, through lack of true and correct information concerning it, for they admitted and gave proof of belief in the very doctrine, it in reality established. The Syrian dissidents, moreover, desirous to sow discord in the Christian Church, industriously propagated the statement that the council had approved the Nestorian heresy, and the Armenian prelates, deceived by their misrepresentations and engrossed by the troubles and conflicts of the time, made no efforts to ascertain the real meaning and purport of its definitions. Another cause of the unhappy alienation was the incorrect translation into the Armenian tongue of a letter of Pope Leo I., since in the explanation therein contained concerning our Lord's two natures, the human and the diviine, the words: *The one and the other* were rendered by an Armenian expression applicable only to persons, not to things. Thus, whereas Pope Leo spoke of two *natures*, the Armenian understood two *persons*. This error was the

occasion of much disputation. The actual separation, however, whereby the Armenian Church was cut off from the rest of Catholic Christendom was gradual. Her bishops attended the fifth, sixth and seventh councils, held respectively at Constantinople, 553 and 680, and at Nicea, 788, and the decrees of each of those councils were asknowledged to be ginding. In 647 the patriarch, Nerses III., held a council at Tovin, the object of which was to seek reconciliation with the orthodox Greek Church, but on account of mutual misunderstanding it came to nothing.

Cut off from the Universal Church, the Armenian bishops became all the more closely identified with their native country and kept alive patriotic feeling in times of great national distress. In spite of foreign domination the Armenian Church preserved its individual character, its dotcrine and discipline, until the fifteenth century, when great dissensions arose. Since the separation errors had crept in; amongst others the monophysite heresy gained many adherents, and a fraternity was formed, called the Unionists, whose object was to reunite the Armenian with the Latin Church by adhering to the national rites and ceremonial, such as the custom of using wine unmixed with water in the celebration of Mass; but unity of faith, not ritual, was the main point to be sought, and the only effect was to give rise to contentions. The Armenian Pontiffs had maintained an epistolary intercourse with the Holy See, with the sincere desire of preserving that union with the centre of Catholicism which they believed to be necessary. In 1541 the Patriarch Stephen V. went on a pilgramage to Rome and was kindly received by the Pope, and his successor sent an ambassador, accompanied by a priest, for the purpose of settling religious differences. Furthermore, a number of young men were sent to be educated at the Propaganda in Rome; on their return to their country they endeavored to spread the principles they had imbibed, to combat the heresies that had found a footing there, and reassert the supremacy of the Holy See. But all efforts at reunion proved futile; the tyranny exercised by the Turkish governors prevented the Romanizing party from effecting their object; the priests, accused of being spies of the Latin powers, were forbidden to officiate or preach in Armenian churches. Persecution followed and an irrevocable schism was the result, the nation being divided into those who firmly adhered to the traditions and rites of the ancient Armenian Church and those who were Roman Catholics. The latter, a small minority, have since suffered much from the intolerance of their antagonists. More than once they have been banished from Armenia; as lately as 1827 the Sultan drove them out of the country under the plea that they were hostile to the government.

The Catholic Armenians now form a separate community presided over by a Catholic Patriarch of their own choice, independent of external control. They are free to build churches and to perform religious ceremonies according to the Roman ritual. There are on Mount Lebanon three Armenian churches with Armeno-Roman Catholic bishops and monks. The chief dignitary enjoys Pontifical rank, granted by Benedict XIV. The inmates of the monastery have no congregation, or scarcely any, to whose spiritual needs they minister, owing to the difficulty of access to that isolated spot, and are undisturbed by strife.

Since the eighteenth century all communication with the See of Rome with a view to reunion has been ended, for the Patriarch of the National Church of Armenia then placed himself under the protectorate of Russia and strengthened the Pontifical authority seated at Etchmiadzin. There are three orders of clergy in Armenia: Bishops, priests and deacons, and three degrees of episcopal rank: the Archbishop, or Catholicos, chief amongst the patriarchs; the bishops, and vartabeds, that is doctors or teachers of theology, who frequently have the charge of a diocese and exercise episcopal powers. The clergy are divided into the black clerics, or monks, alone eligible for the higher clerical offices, and the white, or secular, including parish priests and clerics of an inferior rank. Marriage is permitted before, but not after ordination; a priest's widow may not marry again. Ecclesiastical posts are for the most part hereditary; during his father's lifetime the son may follow a secular calling; this he must leave and enter the priesthood on the death of the priest to whom he is heir.

The Armenian Church has never accepted the filioque clause; on the contrary, the Holy Ghost is definitely stated to proceed from the Father only. Prayers for the dead are admitted, but not indulgences. It holds the seven sacraments; the Holy Eucharist is administered in both elements: unleavened bread is used and unmixed wine. The marriage service is almost the same as in the Greek Church. In administering extreme unction priests only, not the laity, are anointed. Christmas is celebrated on the Feast of the Epiphany, 6th of January.

Such are the present tenets and practice of our separated brethren in Armenia. We cannot do otherwise than admire the courage and constancy they exhibited in days of yore in preserving the faith and the work they had done for civilization and Christianity. All the more must we grieve that they are not one with us, and hope that they may be led to become again true children of the Catholic Church.

Ellis Schreiber.

HISTORY IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

OUR school histories to-day are written with a higher appreciation of the purposes of history, with a more special insistence on its teaching power, and consequently with a more careful choice of materials and with a quite different management of them than hitherto. If history is to perform one of the many duties assigned to it by Cicero, it must be written, our modern historians think, in a new way. Not all of our nations are cultivating the ideals of Sparta, and not all of our children are to grow up Spartans. History, then, must cease to be the chronicle of wars; it must cease to be the biography of generals. Our modern ideas of commerce and civilization call for the treatment and emphasis of the facts of history that have built up and developed trade and education. History, then, must chronicle the bloodless battles of the market and write the life of the poet, the philosopher and the schoolmaster. The battlefield may still occupy a place in the picture, but it must be in the background. The school and the workshop have come to the foreground. Alexander and Hannibal, Cæsar and Napoleon, the heroes of former school days, may still remain prominent, but as retarding or advancing the progress of civilization, and not as conquerors on the field of battle. The catalogue of heroes is vastly different to-day. Read the following noteworthy collection in James Harvey Robinson's "History of Western Europe" (p. 3): "The life and work of a few men of indubitably first-rate importance in the various fields of human endeavor—Gregory the Great, Charlemagne, Abelard, St. Francis, Petrarch, Luther, Erasmus, Voltaire, Napoleon, Bismarck—have been treated with care proportionate to their significance for the world."

The modern newspaper resembles the old histories. War and crime get the headlines and front page; trade gets the fine print in some out-of-the-way corner unknown to the people at large. Civilization is too heavy even for the Sunday issue, and has been relegated to the quarterlies, and virtues are recorded in heaven. Modern school histories have altered this perspective and have brought the annals of progress, of education, of labor, from the foot-note to the text and from the end of the chapter to the beginning. The change is a welcome one; it is a reasonable and excellent one, but our writers should look to it to make the recent method as interesting, if they can, as the former. Their task will not be an easy one. Human nature is a disheartening problem, and the modern press frankly acknowledges and caters to its ignoble tendencies.

To make peace as interesting as war, and virtue as good reading as vice is difficult, but we hope not impossible.

THE CHURCH IN SCHOOL HISTORIES.

The change in method has effected a change in the attitude of school histories towards the Church. If civilization is to be the all-important topic of historical treatment, then the Church must come to the front in the new order of things. Christianity has profoundly influenced civilization, and for sixteen centuries the Church was identified with Christianity. The influence of the Church has in consequence received such full discussion in recent text-books that some of them can be called without much exaggeration Church histories. Professor Robinson in the preface of the work already quoted says: "Institutions under which Europe has lived for centuries, above all the Church, have been discussed with a good deal more fullness than is usual." The author generously fulfills his promise, and no one can justly complain of a want of fullness.

The Church receives not only fuller but also fairer treatment. Modern history prides itself on its appeal to original sources, and although its practice does not always come up to its professions, the Church has benefited wherever such an appeal has been adequately made. The last days of the Roman Empire and the Middle Ages are no longer viewed through the prejudiced medium of writers of the sixteenth century and after. The myth that liberty, learning, civilization, holiness and every other good thing came into existence with the Reformation is not found anywhere recorded on earth now except in mouldering old anti-Popery tracts and a few modern reprints made by the A. P. A. The "Dark Ages" have improved immensely in the new order of things. An essay or even a volume could be written on the various meanings given to the adjective "dark" in that well-known expression. It has passed from the impenetrable black compound of profound ignorance, abject superstition, intense bigotry and irredeemable immorality which the word "dark" conveyed to the mind of the Scotch Calvinists and English Puritans to the almost daylight of the latest historians. Every shade of darkness has been traveled through, and each step in the passing of that darkness has been marked by a conflict. Besides, while the meaning of the adjective was bleaching out, the signification of the noun "ages" was shrinking in extent. The "Dark Ages" took in at one time almost every century from Constantine to Luther. Now they comprehend scarcely a century. Who will write us a history of the term "Dark Ages?"

When the darkness of past history grew lightsome in modern

histories, another great change occurred. The monk had been rehabilitated. The change is not known everywhere yet and will encounter opposition, but not for long. Monasticism now receives its due honor, and is even recognized as a benefactor. Fatness, indolence, sensuality no longer sum up the monastic life. The monasteries are seen to have been the homes of industry, learning and piety. Of course, all these concessions are made grudgingly, and after the panegyric a few parting shots in the good old style are still directed at the monks.

THE USE OF AUTHORITIES.

These good effects have come from the labors of Maitland, Drane, Gasquet, Montalembert and others, and the only reason why there is not greater improvement is that despite the elaborate lists of sources printed in modern school histories and despite the brave flourish of an occasional quotation from them, our historians still draw largely from the turbid stream of secondary authorities instead of going to the pure fountain-head. The current of history is still stained by the infidelity of Gibbon, the rationalism of Lecky and the wild, rhetorical ravings of Draper. If our writers would but critically test these authors, would verify their references whenever they give any, would follow them not blindly but prudently and carefully, they would not fall so often into ludicrous and long exploded errors.

Yet an improvement is manifest, and when modern histories give their lists of secondary authorities, Catholic writers are receiving mention. This practice, however, is not yet as full as it should be, and the Catholic authority very often has little influence upon the text. Yet it is something to have a place of honor among the references. Even here at times there is discrimination shown, and the Catholic writer is labeled with some parenthetical caution about Ultramontanism or the like. It may look oversensitive to remark these trifles, but why should books intended for the use of our public schools label De Broglie, "L'église et l'empire" with the parenthesis "from Catholic point of view,"[1] and leave such writers as Mosheim, Lea, Pressense without label? To mark a history as inaccurate or defective is something every one can understand, but to mark one history Catholic and to leave others unmarked is unintelligible except on the supposition that some doubt is cast on the accuracy of the one and not on the others, or that there is subconscious But in non-sectarian schools, if you begin to discriminate for one in that way, then you must discriminate for all. Besides in history,

[1] Andrews' "Institutes of General History," p. 62.

where truth is the supreme object, there is only one point of view, and sincere Catholic, sincere Protestant and sincere unbeliever are all alike in keeping in view that point. Theoretically history should be as undenominational as algebra, and it is absurd to say a Catholic history as it is to say a Catholic algebra.

Common fairness requires, too, that controverted points should receive impartial treatment or be omitted entirely. In books intended for use in public schools we do not ask that the Catholic side of any controversy be presented to the pupils exclusively, but we do not propose to allow the other side to be stated exclusively. Our platform is: neither side if the question can be waived, or both sides fairly and fully if the question must be taken up. In this matter a number of our recent histories offend, and we purpose to review some of the questions so treated and to discuss the character of some of the histories now used in our public schools. We could not mention all for obvious reasons. We hope those omitted will not regret the omission.

THE PRIMACY OF THE POPE.

One thing is taken for granted in many modern school histories. The Bishop of Rome was not from the beginning authoritative head of the Church, but came to be gradually. Emerton's "Mediæval Europe," p. 42, says: "During the Carolingian period the Roman Primacy was growing into the dominant institution it was to be for the next five hundred years. A very brief review of its history to the death of Charlemagne will prepare us to consider this remarkable development. The first point to be kept in mind is that there *was* a development and not something existing, as Roman Catholic writers would have us believe, from the beginning of Christianity. Doubtless from a very early period, say from about 200, the Bishops of Rome began to feel their importance as heads of the principal Church in the western world and to assert a kind of superiority over all other churches; but this superiority was acknowledged nowhere in the East and was admitted in the West only as a leadership of honor, not authority." The same author in his "Introduction to the Middle Ages," p. 105, says: "The name (Pope) and the power were of slow growth and had nothing to do with the original position of the Roman Bishopric." Professor Andrews in the work already quoted says, p. 90: "Yet its (Rome's) Bishop became sovereign only after a long evolution of opinion." Professor Robinson says, p. 52: "We shall hereafter refer to the Roman Bishop as Pope, although it must not be forgotten that his headship of the Western Church did not for some centuries imply

the absolute power that he came later to exercise over all the other Bishops of Western Europe." The same historian, p. 51, makes the astonishing assertion that in the works of Athanasius, Basil, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine and in general of all the Fathers of the fourth and early fifth centuries, "there is no evidence to indicate that the Bishop of Rome occupied as yet the supreme and dominating position which the Popes later enjoyed." A similar assertion, but more astonishing still, is made by Professor Andrews, p. 93: "They (Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine) repudiated Rome's jural primacy."

Now it is not our business in this place to write a refutation of these statements. It would not be a difficult task to do, and any reputable work on the Primacy, Allies, Kenrick, Rivington, Bottalla, and a host of others, would furnish ample proofs to carry on such a refutation and to combat each and all of these statements. We ask, however, in surprise what reason have such statements for existence in histories made for use in our non-sectarian public schools. Nobody, of course, asks these good professors to accept the Catholic doctrine of the Primacy of the Pope, but everybody demands that in books intended for general use in the so-called non-sectarian schools, supported by the good money of Catholics, no doctrine of the Catholic Church or any other church be openly and flatly denied. Everybody demands that these topics be excluded from school histories, or if they are to be included, they are to be treated fairly. Facts are to be given and not theories; the best authorities on both sides of the question in dispute must be given; the arguments are to be impartially stated, and all offensive partisanship is to be rigorously excluded. This we believe to be a perfectly fair proposal. Nor can these writers urge that the course is too difficult. Professor Emerton in his "Introduction to the Middle Ages," p. 236, has a long note taking up nearly two pages of fine print, and in it he discusses fully and impartially the arguments and authorities for both sides of a "violent controversy" on the origin of feudalism. No doubt Professor Emerton would be justly indignant at the want of fairness and courtesy there would be in a writer who would begin a discussion on the origin of feudalism with the words, "The first point to be kept in mind is that there *was* no such origin of feudalism as writers of the Georg Waitz school would have us believe." Yet the origin of feudalism is a question that mainly concerns specialists and has no practical bearing on modern life, whereas the origin of the Papacy is a question that concerns every one, we may say, and has an immediate and profound bearing on the cherished beliefs of 250,000,000 people. Pro-

fessor Emerton discusses feudalism fully and courteously. He dismisses the Papacy unfairly and summarily. He is a historian when he writes of the former, a controversialist when he writes of the latter. We don't ask these historians to touch such questions, but if they do, we ask them not to forget the elementary duties of their profession.

ROME AND IRELAND.

On many other topics connected with the Church and vitally affecting her doctrine school histories are setting forth false statements and deducing false conclusions hostile to Catholicity. It is commonly asserted, for example, that the Irish Church was independent of Rome. "They (the Irish monks and clergy) knew little of the traditions of the Roman Church and did not regard themselves as subject to the Pope."[2] "The one thing that is fairly clear about it (the introduction of Christianity into Ireland) is that it did not come from the city of Rome itself."[3]

One asks in the face of all these statements, what about the mission St. Patrick received from Rome? Archbishop Healy, of Tuam, at the recent consecration of Armagh Cathedral gave an excellent summing up of the whole question in the following words: "Besides the extraordinary commission from God, St. Patrick had also the ordinary commission from the Pope, St. Celestin. All the ancient lives of the saint assert it; all our native annalists assert it; the book of Armagh, the official record of the primatical see, asserts it; the ablest Protestant writers, like Usher, have admitted it. In fact, the "Roman Mission" was never questioned until our own times, and then only for controversial purposes by certain scholars who had nothing to rely on but a purely negative argument—that if the Pope had sent him to preach in Ireland, Patrick would have certainly mentioned the fact in the "Confession." The Archbishop then went on to show why St. Patrick was silent. "He did not mention it because it was perfectly well known to those whom he addressed."

Again, we do not ask our non-sectarian historians to adopt our side of the question, but we do object to their adopting any side if they treat the question at all. Our position on all controverted subjects in public school histories is "both sides or neither." Perhaps some of these historians do not know that there are two sides. They are victims yet to some extent of the great Protestant tradition. We do not accuse them of being conscious of their unfairness. They are surprised often to hear that there is any

[2] Robinson, p: 62.
[3] Emerton's "Introduction," p. 110.

other way of looking at the matter except the one that their reading and education has made familiar to them. Nothing, for example, could be fairer and more courteous than the tone of Professor Robinson's "History of Western Europe." His principles, his evident sympathy with other people and other conditions than ours, his praiseworthy attempt to judge facts in their original setting and not in the light in which they would be judged to-day, these and many other qualities are all admirable, and in pointing out statements which Catholics cannot allow to be made in an unqualified fashion in our public schools, we do not wish to impugn his motives or question the fairness with which he has written his work. We think, however, that he has been misled or not completely informed on some subjects. The statements we have pointed out and some inaccuracies with regard to the teaching of the Church on the necessity of the sacraments, and the assertion that the doctrine of Transubstantiation "gradually came to be" with the implication that it was not from the Last Supper, are about the only points with which a Catholic may fairly quarrel. Perhaps Professor Robinson has drawn some of his knowledge from what he calls "Lea's monumental contribution to our knowledge of the jurisprudence of the Church." We feel that his sense of justice will lead him in his next edition either to omit these objectionable statements or to give the evidence for the other side.

ANDREWS AND EMERTON.

Professor E. Benjamin Andrews' "Institutes of General History" does not impress one as favorably as the preceding. The style is hurried and gasping. Statements are hurled at one so quickly and breathlessly and so absolutely that one begins to think the judgments and decisions are just as hurried and abrupt. One is surprised sometimes among many statements against the Church to find occasionally a very favorable one cited, as a rule, from a Catholic authority. The impression grows on the reader that Professor Andrews is guided in great measure by the book that happens to be uppermost on his desk when some period of history is under discussion. We hope we are wrong, but we state our impressions. At any rate, Professor E. Benjamin Andrews' "Institutes of General History" will have to be pretty generally overhauled before any conscientious Catholic or fair-minded opponent of Catholicity can allow it into our public schools.

Professor Emerton has written two works from which we have quoted, and he appears to us the only hopeless case so far. Courtesy and fairness will finally save Professor Robinson; a good

supply and a right arrangement on his desk of the proper authorities will save Professor Andrews, but we believe Professor Emerton is beyond salvation, and we proceed to give the reasons for our belief. Professor Emerton is in that blissful state of mind in which he cannot be taught anything about Catholicity. He knows all about it already. He won't go to Catholic authorities because it is simply unnecessary. In his "Introduction to the Middle Ages," which is written in a loose style for fifteen-year-old pupils, he is constantly referring his youthful readers to the pages of the New Testament to refute the absurdities of Catholicism. On page 98 he says to his young theologians, in order to convince them of the absurdity of religious councils and controversies in early days: "If you will go back again to your New Testament and read ever so carefully the four different stories of the life and teaching of Jesus, you will see that He nowhere lays down a definite form of belief which He demands of all His followers." The guileless simplicity of this fatherly advice is really charming. If Professor Emerton had in mind the Boston boy or even Macaulay's English school boy, he has put a severe tax on their proverbial precociousness and would have them rush in where the greatest intellects of all times have scarcely dared to tread. Professor Emerton's fifteen-year-old Pope would put an end to all the controversies of history and abolish all creeds by a simple appeal to the New Testament. Refutation is not our object in this paper, but we might say in passing that we have in mind not a few boys in Boston and out of it who could tell the Professor after reading ever so carelessly that they found in their New Testament some words to the effect that Jesus demanded of His followers, under pain of condemnation, a belief in all that He taught and sent His apostles, with Peter at their head, into the world to teach all nations, not one, but a host of definite beliefs.

On page 99 of the same work the professor says again, speaking of the Arian controversy: "Men had not been content to take the simple account of Jesus as it appears in the New Testament stories, but had made a mystery out of it, and had gone into violent controversies on the question whether Jesus was God, or a man, or both." Now we cannot look on all this as hypocrisy; it must be the undisturbed simplicity of one who has reached the stage in which he can make no further advance in knowledge. He knows it all, and furthermore believes that his theological pupils can without any difficulty reach the same happy state of mind. For this reason, first of all, we despair of Professor Emerton's salvation. It is really too bad that Professor Emerton did not live in the days of Arius and silence him forever by reading, say "the simple accounts

of Jesus" found in the first chapter of St. John. No one else since Christianity began, as far as we know, has found the reading of the New Testament so completely satisfactory as an arbiter of controversy or has found the nature of Christ so simple in its solution as the professor and his fifteen-year-old friends.

In the second place, we give the professor up because he will positively not consult any authorities but anti-Catholic ones. R. F. Littledale, who is the first mentioned and probably most used authority on the supreme power of the Popes, may have had a share in making him distrust Catholics and ridicule their side of the question. We find it hard to believe that Professor Emerton has read Catholic writers even when he pretends to quote their opinions. On page 78 of his "Mediæval Europe," speaking of the "Forged Decretals," he says: "If they were necessary to a system which honestly believed itself to be the one divinely appointed means of leading men into their true relations with God, then to fabricate them and pass them off as genuine must be a work pleasing in God's sight."

Reader, this is a quotation from one of your school histories, and not an offensively controversial anti-Popery tract, dealing in gratuitously insulting and almost blasphemous innuendos; but let us hear this sober historian further. "As to the fact of the forgery there is now no doubt whatever. It is admitted by every one, Roman Catholics as well as others." Very good, professor; you have left controversy and you are now giving history. Alas! that you did not stop there. No, you must continue: "The defense of the Church is that if these decretals were not really written by the earliest Bishops of Rome, they might have been, and, if occasion had arisen, would have been. Such a defense sounds queer to modern ears, but we have to remember that literary forgery, especially where a matter of religion was concerned, has seldom been regarded with too rigid criticism. The end has seemed to justify the means, and the inquiry into origins is a piece of hostile impertinence."

Now, dear reader, we are not going to make impertinence the subject of our story, else we might ask the professor to characterize this bit of disgusting controversy intruded into a history; but we shall ask our historian, who is zealous for the inquiry of origins, where he originated this calumny of the Church's defense; we shall ask him, the scrupulously virtuous historian, whether it does not sound queer to modern ears to ascribe to another a defense he never made, and whether such an action is not a species of literary forgery? It is useless to ask the professor to quote the Roman Catholic writers who give such a defense. From the lofty heights of his superlative

knowledge he would calmly reply that the fact is notorious. We don't wish to enter into a controversy, but it seems to be called for that we here state what is the real defense of Catholic writers in this matter. First, these decretals were written not at Rome, but probably in France and were written not in the interests of the people, but in the interests of the Bishops to protect them against their metropolitans and against the secular power. Secondly, as Protestant writers have asserted that the "Forged Decretals" were the foundation and source of the Pope's supreme powers, Catholic writers have replied and shown that there is no power which the "Forged Decretals" accord to the Pope which he did not have and exercise long before the "Forged Decretals" came into existence. "They changed nothing, altered nothing, added nothing," says Rev. R. F. Clarke, S. J.[4] For other Catholic writers see Conway, "The Question Box," p. 294; Parson's "Studies in Church History," II., p. 90; Ryder's "Catholic Controversy," p. 177. In all these writers there is no such defense as given by Professor Emerton. The real defense he travesties and perverts. The Church does not defend forgery; it defends the prerogatives of the Pope. The Church's real defense is: The Popes had and exercised all the powers mentioned in the "Forged Decretals" long before the forgery; therefore the "Forged Decretals" were not the source of those powers. Professor Emerton's travesty of the Church's defense reads: The Popes might have written the decretals and would have, if occasion had arisen; therefore the forgery of the decretals was justifiable and inquiry into their origin is hostile impertinence. We admit that this so-called defense of the Church sounds very queer, but we do not admit it to be the Church's defense, and we are anxious, if it is not hostile impertinence, to find its origin.

PROFESSOR EMERTON'S ABILITY TO MISUNDERSTAND.

In the last place we give the professor up because we think that even if he went to Catholic authorities, we are not sure he would understand them. We can forgive the simple guilelessness of unimprovable knowledge; we can enter into the frame of mind of a controversialist who in righteous indignation tears to tatters and litter a straw effigy of his own upholstering, but we cannot see what business a man has to try to write a history who can be guilty of such a confusion of ideas as is displayed in the following quotation. One would think it would be easy to get correct information on such a well-known subject as the sacraments of the Catholic Church. Professor Emerton says, page 544, "Mediæval Europe:" "At his

[4] "Historical Papers," p. 44.

birth man was met by the first sacrament of baptism, whereby the portion of 'originalism,' or actual guiltiness which he had brought into the world with him, was removed. During his period of childhood he was theoretically without such sin as brought guilt with it, but at the age of puberty he was received into the full membership of the Christian community of potential sinners by the act of Confirmation, whereby his sinlessness for the moment was established. The third and most sacred of the sacraments was the Eucharist, the vast importance of which in the scheme of the Church polity we have had occasion elsewhere to describe. In the individual case it meant the absolute identification for the moment of the communicant with the person of Christ, and taken in connection with the fourth sacrament of Penance, it removed the guilt of whatever sin he might previously have committed. The sacrament of Penance included confession in the ear of the priest as its natural foundation. The frequency of repetition in the performance of these two central sacramental acts was largely a matter for the individual conscience, but it was for the interest of the priesthood to keep up the zeal of the faithful by urging them to claim their benefits as often as possible. The celebration of the Eucharist came to be the centre of the public religious service—not the sermon, the exhortation to right living, but this mystical, miraculous act of divine interference with the ordinary course of divine action, was made the all absorbing object of interest to the Christian world. It must be repeated at least once a year during life, and finally, when life seemed nearing its close, this sacrament, under the name of the Last Unction, was the last action of the human soul trying to keep itself in harmony with the divine."

We invite the reader to a study of this interesting piece of theology. The sacramental theory of the Church of the Middle Ages was as follows: Original sin is brought into the world in portions by every child. Baptism removes from every child his portion, and up to the age of twelve or thereabouts renders him "theoretically without such sin as brought guilt with it." Whether the child could practically commit sin which would bring guilt with it, we do not know, but it does not seem so in the light of what follows. Confirmation is the next sacrament, and it makes the child a full-fledged member of the Christian community of potential sinners. It seems to have required a sacrament to make a potential sinner in olden times, and until Confirmation was received the child was evidently not a member of the potential sinners. Now the way Confirmation initiates the potential sinner is instructive. "For the moment" (how long that is we are not told) the

act of Confirmation establishes his sinlessness. Here we seem to see a slight contradiction. We imagined that the child was already at least theoretically sinless from baptism. Besides, we do not understand how a child could be made a potential sinner by Confirmation, unless before he was not a member of that edifying Christian community. These are mysteries. But, at any rate, Confirmation establishes the child in sinlessness and by that very act makes one who was already theoretically sinless a potential sinner. We hope you understand. The third sacrament is the Eucharist. "In the individual case this sacrament meant the absolute identification for the moment of the communicant with the person of Christ." We suppose the professor knows the meaning of his words and uses them according to that meaning when he says the communicant becomes for the moment absolutely identical with the person of Christ. To us this is another mystery. The Sacrament of Eucharist, moreover, "taken in connection with the fourth Sacrament of Penance removed the guilt of whatever sin he might previously have committed." Our potential sinner has now evidently left the ranks and has become a member of the community of actual sinners, but he cannot be reinstated in the ranks by Penance unless taken in connection with the Eucharist. The professor goes on to say that confession in the ear of the priest is the natural foundation of the Sacrament of Penance. The expression is peculiar, and the meaning somewhat elusive.

The theory now becomes, in our opinion, slightly confused. We think the professor has for the moment absolutely identified Mass and Communion. At all events "the celebration of Eucharist becomes the centre of the public religious service." Here the professor turns aside to note that the sermon, the exhortation to right living, did not become such a centre. The professor resumes and asserts that "this mystical, miraculous act of divine interference with the ordinary course of divine action was made the all-absorbing object of interest to the Christian world." It is not clear whether the professor refers to Communion or to the Mass; most likely to the latter. This act of miraculous interference, the professor continues, must be repeated once a year during life, and finally, when life seemed nearing its close, this sacrament (whether of the Mass or Communion it is hard to tell), under the name of the Last Unction, is the last action of the human soul trying to keep in harmony with the divine. We find the theory here rather difficult to follow. We do not quite understand how the act of divine interference becomes the last action of a human soul by taking the name of Last Unction. We do not understand that whereas Pro-

fessor Emerton says on page 542, "A sacrament in the Church sense is the outward sign of an inward grace," and on page 543, "A sacrament was a process in which the individual most concerned had no essential part," yet on the very next page Professor Emerton's sacrament of Last Unction, which seems to be the absolute identification of Communion, Mass and Extreme Unction, becomes the last action of a human soul.

Now, after a careful examination of all this confusion, we do not know where one could find a better example of complete ignorance associated with the supposed possession of complete knowledge. We do not remember having seen anywhere such a hopeless mixture of ideas concerning Catholic practice. We don't think a more ludicrous attempt at writing up Church beliefs and practices has been made since the Bible reader whom Newman describes in the "Present Position of Catholics in England" gave out his account of the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. We ask in sheer amazement where the professor got his theology. We do not believe he has fished it up from the dark depths of his sub-consciousness or drawn it down from the lofty clouds of his over-soul. Where did he get it? It is true that on page 542, in beginning to speak of the sacramental system, he alludes to the writings of the later scholastics and to the Summa of Thomas Aquinas, but having had many years' acquaintance with both of these, we know that they set forth no such theory as Professor Emerton ascribes to the Middle Ages. We had rather believe the Professor was quoting second or third-hand, though he pretends not to be, than to believe that his ability to misunderstand is as egregious as a first-hand acquaintance with these high authorities would argue.

The publishers of Professor Emerton's works say: "Professor Emerton's scholarly histories are *widely used.* They have taken a high place on account of their *clearness,* their *accuracy* in *statement* and *conclusion,* their interpretation of the reasons of great movements and their *reliance upon original sources.*" We have taken the liberty of italicizing this manifesto as well as the following commendation from Anson D. Morse, professor of history, Amherst College: "Professor Emerton seems to me to have surpassed most authors who have treated mediæval Europe in presenting as conclusions only what the evidence warrants. He is an *unusually safe guide* for that period." As the publishers stated that Professor Emerton's books were widely used, we inquired of them how many public schools used them, and we received a reply stating that "Professor Emerton intended these books for college work, and they have never been introduced to any extent in the public schools."

The wide use is apparently restricted to colleges. We must remark, however, that Professor Emerton's first intention, at least with regard to the "Introduction," was not college work. He says in his preface to "Mediæval Europe:" "When I began the former volume (*i. e.*, "An Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages") I had in mind a reader of about fifteen years of age; but this person grew insensibly older as the work progressed, and, in fact, the book has found its chief use in the earlier stages of college teaching." It was these words we had in mind in the criticism we have given. Our remarks hold equally true for non-sectarian colleges.

The reader must by this time be curious to know who Professor Emerton is, where he works and what his business is. We copy the following from his title page: "Ephraim Emerton, Ph. D., Professor of History in Harvard University."

DUTY OF CATHOLICS.

In the light of the facts we have mentioned, the duty of Catholics is clear. Whether they are members of the school board or principals or teachers or ordinary taxpayers, it is their duty to protest against the presence of such books in their schools. It has often been remarked, and it needs to be said again, that we are bound to this duty more for the sake of our Protestant pupils than for our Catholic pupils. In the case of the latter statements against the Church are accepted with reserve, and inquiry usually elicits the true state of the matter, but in the case of Protestant pupils there are no misgivings. All statements against the Church are received with the confidence youth gives to print, and go to build up prejudice or ignorance of the Church's history and practices. If the histories used in our schools are carefully selected, if objectionable passages are cut out, if controverted questions are treated fairly either by not taking them up at all or by giving both sides, the question boxes of our missions to non-Catholics will not be filled with the calumnies learned at school. We must take the stream of prejudice at its source and stop it there. Publishers are naturally most anxious to give satisfaction; authors should be made to give it. We really think that the reading of history does more harm in our schools than any reading of the Bible, even with doctrinal comments, would do. We are all on our guard against such comments, but we are not always on our guard against statements in histories which come with the apparent authority of uncontroverted facts.

If, for example, Peter was not the supreme authority appointed by Christ to rule over His Church, if the Popes of Rome are not Peter's successors in that authority, then the Catholic Church is

not the true Church of Christ. We cannot permit any history into our public schools which denies these truths. We cannot permit our histories to teach the Anglican theory of Peter's and the Pope's supremacy of honor, not of authority, or any other theory which looks on the Pope's authority as a usurpation. That the Pope's authority developed with the development of the Church in the sense that temporal dominion was added to it, that feudal powers were accorded to it by the consent of Christendom during the Middle Ages, or in the sense that an authority exercised over many millions is greater in extent, in its body of laws and regulations and in its many details of system than that exercised over a few thousands, such a development we admit and such is written large on the face of history. But that the Popes' supreme power over the Church from not being came to be in the course of time by fraud, by usurpation, by the sole force of circumstances and not by the wish and appointment of Christ, no Catholic can admit, and there is no fact in history whose evidence compels him to admit it. On the contrary, we hold that history gives its evidence in favor of that supreme authority. There are, indeed, difficulties and serious ones, but they can be and have been answered. At all events, history gives no evidence to warrant the unqualified assertions we have found in some of our school books. We ask for the plain statement of the facts of history. Let us have them, and the Catholic will go home from school and draw his conclusions that the primacy always was, from Peter to Pius, while the Protestant may go home drawing the conclusion that the primacy was a title of honor merely, or a development from nothing by forgery, usurpation and the chance concurrence of favorable circumstances. Give us the facts in school; let the theories be applied and conclusions drawn at home.

Finally, we say again that we don't ask the writers of our histories to teach Catholicity, but we do ask that they refrain from teaching anti-Catholicity. There are histories extant at present which have managed quite well to give the facts of history without drawing the conclusions of agnosticism, atheism, Protestantism of any form or Catholicism. They have other defects, but they do not seem to be marred, as far as our reading allows us to judge, by the defects which mar the histories we have criticized. If we single out any such histories for mention, it is for the simple reason that when objections are urged against a history in use, we must be prepared to suggest a substitute if our objections are to be effective. We mention, then, Sanderson and Hardiman's "Epitome of the World's History" and Fisher's "Outlines of Universal History" as

coming up in great part to the standard we ask for. If, however, even these appear unsuitable, let objections be urged until they and all other histories are satisfactorily revised, or until a new, fair and thoroughly non-sectarian history is written for the use of our public schools.

FRANCIS P. DONNELLY, S. J.

Scientific Chronicle.

ELECTRICITY AS A MOTIVE POWER IN TRANSPORTATION.

The rapid growth of electricity as a motive power in transportation has been brought before the public rather forcibly of late by the action of certain large steam railroad corporations in securing the control of large electrical traction interests, especially in the eastern portion of the country. As far as the steam roads were concerned the first electric roads, which were merely urban, were a useful adjunct, transferring passengers from one station to another in the large cities. When, however, the electric roads expanded and became suburban and interurban they became powerful competitors in the contest for passenger traffic, and on account of the advantage of position the electric road was the winner in almost every contest.

The opposition that at once arose on the part of the steam roads was at first confined to an effort to prevent the granting of charters to the electric roads. This failed so often where the evident public transportation facilities offered by the electrics demanded them that the steam roads have adopted another policy, namely, that of buying up the electric roads.

The question uppermost in the public mind is whether this action of the railroads means that the total facilities of transportation be increased or the facilities arising from sharp competition be removed. If the former, we may look to an enlargement of the field of electric traction and the public will be benefited. If the latter, the development of electric traction will be arrested for a time in certain localities and the public will suffer inconvenience and have a right to complain.

An important interview with Mr. Horace E. Andrews, published in the *Street Railway Journal*, clearly intimates the object of the steam railway companies, at least in the case of the New York Central. The Vanderbilt interests have secured control of the electric traction situation in Central New York. It appears, however, that the intention of the New York Central is to extend the electric traction system entirely across New York State. This will be accomplished by buying up existing electric traction interests where it is judged desirable and by electrifying portions of the West

Shore Railroad. The first step in this direction will be the electrifying of the West Shore between Utica and Syracuse.

The method of applying the electric current has not yet been decided upon. There is an objection to the overhead trolley, for the road is still to be used for steam traffic, and such an arrangement would endanger the lives of brakemen who have to walk on the tops of freight cars. The third rail system is also objectionable on account of the great number of grade crossings. A form of side contact trolley is being considered and may eventually be adopted. Whatever method may be adopted, it is certain that the short-haul passenger traffic and the package express will be taken care of by the electric division of the system. This opens up a large field for the development of electricity as a motive power.

In this same connection we note with pleasure that the New Haven Road has announced the improvement of its suburban service near New York. Four of its six tracks will be converted into the third-rail electric type, two for local and two for express trains, to run under a fifteen-minute headway. A connection will be made with the new subway and travel from the business section of the city to the suburbs facilitated. The electric installation of the Fourth avenue tunnel by the New York Central must be added to this scheme of electric motive power development.

The tendency of the large roads to develop rather than retard the progress of electricity as a motive power was shown by the New Haven Road during the past season. Several of the sea beaches had many advantages that should make them popular, but at the time the traffic would not warrant the construction of a trolley line. The company installed motor cars from the nearest railroad station to these localities and the increase in traffic has been such as to justify in the near future the construction of a trolley line as a feeder to the main steam road in accordance with similar developments in other localities.

Whatever the outcome of this struggle between electricity and steam it is certain that steam has capitulated in the case of city tunnels and of bridges and for suburban traffic, short haul feeders in country districts and even for express service in certain places.

BORAX AS A FOOD PRESERVATIVE.

From time immemorial men have endeavored by some means or other to arrest the natural decay of food products so as to preserve them for future use. The "putting up" of preserves is an event of frequent occurrence in most families. The smoke-house

is a familiar feature of many farmyards. Salting and pickling are universal means of such preservation. Alcohol, too, has been used. These means are all of a more or less respectable antiquity. More recently the chemist has suggested a number of substances to be used for this purpose, such as borax, salicylic and sulphurous acids. Their success as preservatives was various. We will not concern ourselves with this here. But the question arose, were not these foreign substances in food injurious to the health of the persons who partook of such food? It was to answer this question as satisfactorilly as possible that an interesting series of experiments was recently conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture under the direction of Dr. H. W. Wiley, chief of the Bureau of Chemistry. Borax and boric acid were the preservatives examined. The results, of which what follows here is a digest, will be found either in Bulletin No. 84 of the Bureau of Chemistry, or in a summary form in Circular No. 15 of the same bureau.

Twelve young men, most of them connected with the Department of Agriculture, volunteered for the experiment. They were of temperate habits and in good health, and during the course of the investigations went about their occupations as usual. A dining room and kitchen were fitted up in the basement of the laboratory building of the Bureau and a bountiful table of wholesome food was provided. In the beginning the borax or boric acid was added to the food, but as this caused disgust in the subjects, either from the detection of it by the taste or from the imagination, it was afterwards administered in capsules in amounts corresponding to those which would have been added to the food itself. This made no difference in the results, as the contents of the capsules were rapidly mixed with the food in the stomach by the latter's peristaltic action, the capsules dissolving in a very few moments. Every precaution was taken to avoid disturbances, and the results cannot have been much vitiated by any outside cause. The candidates were under the medical supervision of Assistant Surgeon General H. D. Geddings and remained at the hygienic table about six months from December, 1902.

There were three periods in each series of experiments, the fore, preservative and after periods. In the fore period no borax was added to the food, and in this it was found that the average daily weight of the moist food, including water drank, was 4.20 per cent. of the total weight of the body. The figures for the preservative and after periods were 4.22 per cent. and 4.21 per cent, respectively. Evidently the use of the preservative had very little effect on the amount of food consumed. At this rate of food consumption it

would appear that an average healthy young man would consume in twenty-four days an amount of moist food, including water drunk, equal to his own weight. If we reduce the amount of food consumed to a water-fall basis the 4.20, 4.22 and 4.21 per cent. become 0.96, 0.99, 1.01; that is an amount of dry food equal in round numbers to one per cent. of the weight. The preservative tended to decrease slightly the weight of the body; this tendency was continued in most cases during the after period. There were a number of other physiological effects which one can find in the publications mentioned. We are more interested here with the conclusions reached. These are that it is better not to use borax or boric acid as a food preservative, even in small quantities. One-half a gram (7½ grains) a day, from the results, is too much for the normal man to receive regularly, though he may safely receive it for a limited period of time. In larger doses acute symptoms manifest themselves. "It is certain," to quote Dr. Wiley, "that the normal man could not long continue to receive three grams per day. . . . It appears, therefore, that both boric acid and borax, when continuously administered in small doses for a long period, or when given in large quantities for a short period, create disturbances of appetite, of digestion and of health."

THE ST. LOUIS CONGRESS OF ARTS AND SCIENCES.

In the latter part of September there assembled at the World's Fair at St. Louis what was perhaps the most notable gathering of eminent representatives of art and science ever brought together in one congress. The object of this conclave was not the presentation of new discoveries and opinions, but rather the attempt to bring into closer relations the widely divergent and diverging specialties into which modern science is divided. To accomplish this end the plan of holding one general meeting on the opening day, at which all the delegates met, was adopted. On the second day this body divided itself into seven grand divisions, and in each of these was treated the unity of one of the seven divisions which had been made of science. These grand divisions were further divided into twenty-four departments, in which the fundamental conceptions and the progress of knowledge in each department was discussed. Following this the congress was further divided into about 128 sections, in which were discussed the problems and progress of the special sciences and the relations of each to the others. Some

three hundred addresses by eminent investigators were delivered on the unity, conceptions, history, relations and problems of the main sub-divisions of knowledge. A noteworthy feature of the congress is the fact that history, art, diplomacy, religion, education and indeed most of the great fields of human activity are brought into the plan. A better understanding between the representatives of these and those of the exact sciences ought to result. If the only achievement of the congress were the bringing more prominently forward the absurdity of the belief that there is or can be any conflict between religion and science, although there may be between religion and some scientists, its work and the immense labor its organization entailed will not have been in vain.

NOTES.

The Barocyclonometer.—In the exhibit of the Philippine Weather Bureau at St. Louis there is displayed a somewhat small instrument of vast utility to the mariner, especially in the typhoon infested seas of the Far East. It is called by its inventor, the director of the bureau, the barocyclonometer, and its use is to predict the approach and direction of typhoons. It consists of an aneroid barometer which gives warning of the approach of the cyclone, and which can be adapted to the different normal barometric heights one finds in the Far East. This indicates the approach of the storm and its approximate distance. Besides the barometer, the apparatus holds also a cyclonometer, a new instrument, by means of which, owing to an ingenious arrangement, the direction of the vortex or centre of a typhoon can be judged with accuracy as well as the direction in which the centre is moving. The value of such an instrument is incalculable to mariners in the region mentioned, and in fact in any region of sudden and violent storms.

A New Satellite of Saturn.—A ninth member has been added to Saturn's family of satellites. Its discovery was first announced by Professor W. H. Pickering, of Harvard Observatory, who found it on the star photographs taken at the southern station of the observatory at Anequipa, in Peru. Its orbit could not then be exactly determined. A recent note from the observatory confirms the discovery. The period of the satellite is about a year and a half. Its distance from Saturn is nearly 8,000,000 miles. It is very faint, being of a magnitude of 15½, and cannot be observed by any

telescope of less than two feet aperture. Its diameter, judged from its brightness, is about 200 miles and is remarkable for having a period six times longer than that of any other satellite in the solar system. Professor Pickering has named it Phœbe. Phœbe was a sister of Saturn. Three of his satellites had been named after his sistersfi Rhea, Dione and Lethys, and two after his brothers, Hyperion and Japetus, so the new-comer will feel quite at home. The members of the family are, however, very widely separated.

Dispelling Fog by Electricity.—Sir Oliver Lodge has succeeded recently in dispelling fog by electricity. The feasibility of this method on a small scale was proved first in the laboratory some years ago, when Sir Oliver succeeded in changing a cloud of steam in a bell jar into a fine rain by means of an electric discharge. So an experimental wire was led to a flag-staff on the roof of the laboratory of the university at Birmingham, England, the base of the wire being connected to the positive pole of a high-tension static electric machine, the opposite pole being laid to the earth. The wire terminated in a number of fine points, as widely separated as possible. The electricity streamed from these and the fog in the immediate vicinity of the points, leaving a space absolutely clear.

D. T. O'Sullivan, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews.

IRISH LITERATURE. . Justin McCarthy, M. P., Editor-in-chief.; Maurice F. Egan, LL. D., Douglas Hyde, LL. D., Lady Gregory and James Jeffrey Roche, LL. D., associate editors; Charles Welsh, managing editor. 10 vols. Large 8vo. pp. 4,500, illustrated. Philadelphia: John D. Morris & Co.

The opening paragraph of Justin McCarthy's introductory article indicates the intent and purpose of the work. He says:

"'Irish Literature' is intended to give to the reading world a *comprehensive*, if only rapid, glance at the whole development of literary art in prose and poetry from the opening of Ireland's history. I may say at once that when I use the words 'opening of Irish history' I do not intend to convey the idea that the survey is limited to that period of Ireland's story which is recognized as coming within the domain of what we call authenticated historical narrative. The real history of most countries, probably of all countries, could be but little understood or appreciated, could indeed hardly be proved to have its claim to authenticity, if we did not take into account the teachings of myth and of legend. This is especially to be borne in mind when we are dealing with the story of Ireland. Only by giving full attention to the legends and the poems, the memory of which has been preserved for us from days long before the period when the idea of authentic history had come into men's minds, can we understand the character and the temperament of the Irish race."

It will be seen at a glance that such a work has a world-wide significance because it embraces the literary productions of a period in history hardly covered by any other literature, but principally because it includes treasures drawn from the rich field of ancient Celtic literature almost unknown in modern times until very recently, when the study of Ireland's national language has brought them to light. The importance of the literature of this period not only to the student of Irish history, but to the student of history in general, may be gathered from the following quotation:

"The old bardic literature gives us the history of the ancient Irish, as told spontaneously and believingly by themselves in the pagan times before Europe had begun at all to influence their ideas. It is the fount at which the pagan Irish drank in their moral and religious ideas—the source of their martial aspirations in the heroic age—the well whence they drew the inspiration of gentle and noble thoughts, of family affections, of loyalty to friends, of social justice,

of faith in treaties, of fair play in war, of respect for the weak, of reverence for the heroes and the immortal gods of Erin."

The comprehensiveness of the work shows clearly the continuity of Irish genius reaching back at least two thousand years and lost sight of during that long middle period when the suppression of the national language forced Ireland's sons to express their gems of thought in a foreign tongue, and almost hide their national identity in a foreign land. But even during that period the very obstacles which might have prevented the literary advancement of any other nation furnished occasions for the greater development of Irish genius. The characteristics of the Irish nature are so pronounced that they cannot be suppressed or entirely hidden. They may not stand out so strikingly at all times, but they are always apparent to any except the most superficial student. A work like that before us was required to emphasize this truth, for the number of names in English literature that rightfully belong to the little island across the way is surprising.

It is not our purpose, however, to create the impression that "Irish Literature" has a historical value only, although this is very great. Its strongest claim lies in its intrinsic merits. The world has no finer specimens of song and story, of legend and anecdote, of play and romance than those which have come from the pen of Irishmen.

A work of this kind, so extensive and so comprehensive, required very careful planning on a large and liberal scale, and the most important consideration was the editorial staff, for no one man could do it successfully within a reasonable time, if at all. The name of the Hon. Justin McCarthy, recognized wherever the island is known as preëminently a man of letters and a statesman, was the very best that could be found to head the list. He has been assisted by a goodly group, chosen like himself because of their general fitness, and each one because of his or her special fitness for some particular branch of the work.

The plan followed was excellent and ought to produce the best results. It is thus told in the words of the managing editor:

"First of all the whole field of Irish literature, including the works of the translators from the ancient Irish, was carefully surveyed and a mass of material was collected sufficient in quantity for two or three such libraries as this. Lists of these authors and their writings were then prepared and forwarded to each member of the committee of selection, who subjected these lists to a most careful and critical process of elimination.

"The results of their independent recensions were carefully

brought together, compared and combined. A new list was then made and this, after being submitted to each of the associate editors, was in turn finally examined and passed upon by the editor-in-chief, Hon. Justin McCarthy, and the eminent critic, Mr. Stephen Gwynn, in personal conference. Literary merit and human interest have been the touchstones employed in choosing the contents of this work, and at the same time care has been taken to avoid anything which could wound the feelings or offend the taste of any class or creed.

"The selection has been made without bias, religious, political or social, and without fear or favor. There has been no dearth of the right material. Indeed, the problem was, 'What to discard?' At the same time certain of these writings were scattered through so many centuries and in so many remote places, that their discovery and inclusion here makes them treasure-trove."

The question of arrangement was a serious one, and after much thought the alphabetical method of presenting the material was decided on. Hence each author is presented in alphabetical order. Each author is introduced by a short biographical sketch, generally brief, but comprehensive and satisfying.

The tenth volume contains brief biographies of ancient Celtic authors, translations from whose works appear in the other volumes under the names of translators. This volume also contains a number of contributions printed in Gaelic characters, with English translations on the opposite pages.

One of the most valuable features in "Irish Literature" is a series of special articles written by men who are the best qualified to deal with the subject assigned to them. These constitute a complete philosophical survey of the whole field and embody the latest knowledge on the subject of the origin, development and growth of the national literature of Ireland, including the "General Introduction," by Mr. Justin McCarthy; "Modern Irish Poetry," by Mr. William Butler Yeats; "Early Irish Literature," by Dr. Douglas Hyde; "Ireland's Influence on European Literature," by Dr. George Sigerson; "Irish Novels," by Maurice Francis Egan; "Irish Orators and Oratory," by the late J. F. Taylor; "The Sunniness of Irish Life," by Mr. Michael McDonough; "Irish Wit and Humor," by Mr. D. J. O'Donoghue; "A Brief Glance at Irish History" and "The Fairy and Folk Tales of Ireland," by Mr. Charles Welsh, and "The Irish Literary Theatre," by Mr. Stephen Gwynn.

In no field of action is it truer that the end crowns the work than in book-making, and the crown is the index. In this work there are

several crowns, each admirable and each enhancing its value. They are so many keys which open the doors that lead the reader at once to every author, topic or department, instead of introducing him through the outer door only, and then leaving him at the entrance to a long corridor, with numerous doors, on which he must knock until he finds the man he is searching for.

Looking at the work as a whole, the thinking man must say: the makers of this book have done a great work, never done before, too long postponed, and at last done well. All classes of readers are their debtors, but especially Irishmen and their descendants, for this array of great authors, orators, statesmen, dramatists and poets must convince the world that Ireland is no less worthy of her place among the nations now than she was when she merited the title of the "Islands of Saints and Scholars," and when Dr. Johnson called her the "School of the West, the quiet habitation of sanctity and literature."

THE OLD RIDDLE AND THE NEWEST ANSWER. By *John Gerard, S. J., F. L. S.* 12mo., pp. x+293. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The Old Riddle is: What is the force or power at the back of Nature which first set her going, and whence does she draw the capability of performing the operations which we find her performing every day; that force or power which must be the ultimate origin of everything that is in the world? And the Newest Answer is supposed to be furnished by modern scientists in evolution.

Although the author does not say so, his book is an admirable answer to the Rationalist Press Association, and more especially to "Haeckel's Riddle of the Universe." We cheerfully subscribe to the estimate of a reviewer who says: "The answer is as complete as it is crushing. Father Gerard carries the war into the enemies' camp, and once there, makes havoc of the defenses."

The book is admirable in every respect. The claims of those who hold that evolution has finally solved the enigma of the universe are fairly and clearly stated, and then the answers to those claims are so tersely and cogently put that no fair-minded man can escape from them.

It is all done so neatly and so brightly that the book has a charm about it rare in works of this kind. It will be especially useful for those who are attending our public high schools and secular universities where materialism is in the atmosphere, if not secretly or publicly taught. We warmly recommend the parents of

such persons—Protestant or Catholic—to place this book in their hands.

CONCERNING THE HOLY BIBLE: Its Use and Abuse. By the *Right Rev. Monsignor John S. Vaughan,* Canon of Westminster, author of "Life After Death," "Faith and Folly," "Thoughts for all Times," etc. 12mo., pp. xvi.+269. London: R. & T. Washbourne. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The Right Rev. author tells us that he was moved to pen the present work by the Encyclical of our late Holy Father Leo XIII. on the Holy Scriptures and by the sayings of other saintly men on the same subject. All these writers dwell upon the necessity of the Holy Scriptures for all classes of men. Our author noticed that innumerable works of great erudition exist for the learned and leisured classes, while there are very few helps for the masses. The present work has been written to help these. The author says: "We address ourselves to the masses of the people—to the multitudes that fill our churches, to the ordinary men and women of the world, to tradesmen, artisans and laborers, whether in field or factory—in a word, to those many millions of men and women whose occupations allow them little time for deep study and prolonged and wearisome research."

This is surely a noble purpose, and the author has carried it out in his usual orderly, clear style. The history of the Bible, the various copies, the translations, its inspiration, its interpretation, its treatment by the Catholic Church and by the sects, its difficulties—all are passed upon in a manner which does not require deep learning in the reader, because all perplexing, abstruse and recondite questions and contentions have been avoided.

The book is really all that it claims to be and may be recommended in the highest terms. French, Italian and Dutch editions are being prepared.

DISSERTATIONES SELECTÆ IN HISTORIAM ECCLESIASTICAM. Auctore *Bernardo Jungmann,* Eccl. Cathedr. Brugens. Canon. hom. Philos, et S. Theolog., Doct. ac Profess. ord. Hist. eccl. et Patrol. in Universitate Cath. Lovaniensi. Tomi vii., 8vo. pp. circ. 3,150. Neo Eboraci: Fr. Pustet.

It speaks well for the study of ecclesiastical history that a new edition of Professor Jungmann's dissertations should be called for at this time. Originally given as lectures at Louvain, they were put into this permanent form, first for the benefit of the students at Louvain who were taking courses in theology and canon law at that institution, and secondly to furnish material for those who had

to take part in public discussions before receiving their academic degrees.

The book treats of the leading events in ecclesiastical history beginning with the first century and ending with the eighteenth. It resembles in this respect Palma's work in Latin and Parson's in English. After a chapter on the rise and progress of ecclesiastical history and its division into three epochs extending from the beginning to the seventh century, from the seventh to the sixteenth, and from the sixteenth to the present time, the author treats in order of St. Peter at Rome, the Popes of the first and second centuries, the General Councils, the heresies, the disputes which from time to time disturbed the Church in general in regard to questions of government, discipline or ceremonial and the reigns of particular Popes who stand out in history because of the conditions in which they lived or some controversy in which they took part.

The striking characteristics of the dissertations are their clearness, their fullness and their order. The author's style is winning; he knows what his students need and he supplies, and he does not require them to go to some one else to supply deficiencies, although he quotes the best authorities at every step. The student of Church history has here an admirable collection of treatises on leading topics which will not disappoint him.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. Abridged edition. By *Rev. Francis E. Gigot, S. S., D. D.*, Professor of Sacred Scripture in St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore. 12mo., pp. 347. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This abridged edition of the reverend writer's larger work, which was published a few years ago and which was so well received that the third edition is almost exhausted, has been prepared in order to enable students to cover the whole ground in the short time at their disposal for this study, and also to furnish a text-book on the subject for colleges and other institutions where the larger work could not be used. In order that the original work may serve for reference, and also for more extensive study for those who have time to pursue it, the abridged edition takes up the same general topics and follows the same general method of treatment as the larger work. The "Synopses" of the chapters have been substantially preserved, and the text of the complete edition, though constantly shortened, has been extensively utilized. Questions of minor importance have either been dropped or materially abridged, or at least printed in smaller type.

There is need of a book of this kind, and if it is the means of

spreading the study of the Holy Scriptures, as it should be, it will have done a good work.

LIFE AND LIFE-WORK OF MOTHER THEODORE GUERIN, Foundress of the Sisters of Providence at St. Mary's of the Woods, Vigo County, Indiana. By a Member of the Congregation. Preface by Right Rev. Francis Silas Chatard. Introduction by His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons. 12mo., pp. xx.+500. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This intensely interesting biography of Mother Theodore adds a very important chapter to the history of the Church in the West. The Diocese of Vincennes is one of the oldest in that region, and the name of Mother Theodore is closely identified with it from the time that she and her companions set out from their mother house in Ruille-suer-Loir until the present, for the spirit of that intrepid woman who obeyed the voice of God calling her across the sea and by perilous journeys to the then almost unexplored nearer West, still lives and vivifies her worthy followers in the houses which have grown from the humble foundation of nearly three-quarters of a century ago. The story of that call, of the long and painful journey by land and of the foundation in a log cabin in the midst of a forest, of the many struggles that followed, met bravely, won nobly—all this is graphically told, generally in her own words as found in her diary and letters. It is a beautiful story, and one can feel his faith as he reads it. Its publication will do good in many ways. It was due to her whose deeds it narrates; it furnishes valuable material for the future Church historian; it sets up an example which religious may follow and the laity emulate.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ELOQUENCE. By *Don Antonio de Capmany*, Member of the Royal Academy of History, and the Royal Academy of Literature, Seville. Translated from the Spanish by the Rev. W. McLoughlin, Mt. Melleray Abbey, Waterford. 12mo., pp. xxviii.+318. Dublin: James Duffy & Co.

The translator says: "Looking through the shelves of the abbey library one day, I happened by the merest accident to meet an old Spanish book neatly printed and handsomely bound, with ornamental guilding, in what might be termed a genteel style, but bearing all the marks of age. On examining it more closely it seemed to me a most excellent work, written by an accomplished scholar of sound judgment and refined taste, perfectly familiar with the great models of antiquity, and I could not but conclude that if it were translated into English it might be useful to many persons. Such were the incidents that led to this translation."

The author says as to his object: "The chief end proposed in this work is the analysis of those magnificent flashes of intellect, those sublime sayings which in all ages and lands have won for their authors the fame of eloquence. Thus I limit myself to the general principles of oratory as points suitable for the taste, practice and benefit of the majority of readers, and I treat as almost irrelevant the other parts of rhetoric. This art is taught in the halls, and in them are formed rhetoricians; but men who have held sway over others by their powers of speech have attained to eminence in the world by a desire of emulating the glory of distinguished orators, or by a necessity of imitating their example in the defense of virtue, truth and justice."

There remains nothing for us to say except that the author has faithfully carried out his purpose and the translator has faithfully provided an English dress for his work.

DIE RUTHENISCH-RŒMISCHE KIRCHENVEREINIGUNG GENANNT UNION ZU BREST. Von Dr. Eduard Likowski, Weihbischof in Posen. Aus dem Polnischen uebertragen von Prælat *Dr. Paul Jedzink*. Freiburg: Herder. Price, $2.10 net.

This is a German translation of a work originally written in Polish by the Auxiliary Bishop of Posen, on occasion of the tercentennial of an event of prime importance in the history of the Ruthenian Church. The Ruthenians are of Slavish origin, who having been converted to Christianity by the Greek missionaries, Sts. Cyril and Methodius, follow the Greek Rite and use the Greek liturgy translated into their ancient tongue. Their history, contrasted with that of their brethren in race, the faithful Poles, is an emphatic demonstration of the important part which the Latin language has played in the development of culture and the preservation of ecclesiastical unity. Poland, converted by the West and always in close touch with Western Europe, has remained one of the loyalest of Catholic nations, and has taken a very prominent part in the evolution of the sciences. Witness the immortal name of Copernicus. These advantages were denied the Ruthenians; and it is hard to suppress a doubt as to the wisdom of the policy adopted by their saintly apostles, and sanctioned by Pope Nicholas I. of using a separate language in their sacred liturgy. Like the other spiritual subjects of Byzantium, they drifted unconsciously into schism, forgot in course of time the allegiance due to the Apostolic See, and when, in 1589, Moscow declared itself independent of Constantinople, the Ruthenians found themselves in the embarrassing position of belonging politically to Catholic Poland, whilst they

were bound by ties of religion to the hereditary enemies of their country, the Russians. The anomaly suggested its own remedy. A strong national sentiment, fostered by Jesuit missionaries and encouraged by the Polish Government, was awakened among them in favor of reunion with Rome. The terms of agreement were established in a great synod held in 1596 in the town whose unpronounceable name of Brzesc has been mitigated into Brest. The Ruthenians were received into the bosom of the one true Church, retaining their traditional rites and customs. This event, so joyful to the Catholic world, had a maddening effect on that insensate brute, which is now feeling the strength of God's just vengeance, the Russian Bear. Just then the Muscovite rage was impotent and ridiculous; but religion as well as freedom "shrieked when Kosciuszko fell." The brutal treatment of the United Ruthenians by Russian despotism during the past century makes one's blood boil. Happy those of the unfortunate race who, in the partition of Poland, fell to Austria! Bishop Likowski hopes for better days in the near future, and does not despair of the conversion of Russia itself. May his anticipations prove veracious. Should it ever happen that the Muscovite entered the bosom of Mother Church, the terms of union would, no doubt, be identical with those of the Synod of Brest.

CONCILIUM TRIDENTINUM. Diariorum, Actorum, Epistularum, Tractatuum Nova Collectio. Edidit Societas Goerresiana. Tomus Quartus: Actorum Pars Prima. Collegit, Edidit, Illustravit Stephanus Ehses: Friburgi Brisgoviæ. Sumptibus Herder. Introductory pages, cxli.; text, 619. Price, $15.00 net.

Two years ago we extended a most hearty greeting to the first volume of this important publication, which we owe to the enterprise of the Goerres Society and of the renowned house of Herder. As we then explained, the vast field has been mapped out and the labor divided among several intellectual toilers. To Dr. Merkle has been assigned the task of editing the official diaries and allied documents. He estimates that his part of the work will fill three stately volumes, the first of which has already appeared and has met with unstinted applause. The *Acta* of the Council have been entrusted to the capable hands of Stephen Ehses, the distinguished priest who conducts the Historical Institute of the Goerres-Gesellschaft in Rome, is associate editor of the Roemische Quartalschrift, has written many valuable monographs and from whom, since he is still in the prime of life, we may expect even greater things in days to come. The present volume is in every way worthy of the subject and of the editor's reputation for exhaustive research.

The introductory pages, in which he sums up the *Vorgeschichte* of the Council, will be extremely useful to teachers of Church history, because, confining himself strictly to the subject in hand, to the exclusion of all matters extraneous to his purpose, he gives a succinct narrative of all events that tended to advance or retard the convocation of the Council. The main body of the book is occupied with the complete *Acta*, together with everything therewith connected, beginning with the abortive effort to convoke the Council in Mantua in 1536, and ending with the third session held in Trent, February 4, 1546. The array of documents brings out more prominently than the most eloquent historian could have done the indomitable energy of the grand old Farnese Pontiff, Pope Paul III., and causes us to regret that he was not seated on the Papal Chair when the religious disturbances first broke out. It will be seen, therefore, that at the end of this huge volume we have only reached what Ehses appropriately terms "the vestibule" of the Council of Trent. The Fathers are assembled in their places; the chosen preachers have spoken impressively of the magnitude and importance of the tasks that lie before them; all preliminaries incidental to the organization of a great deliberative assembly have been discussed and settled; the Council is now ready for the transaction of business. The next volume will open with the immortal fourth session, in which the Catholic Church in council assembled defined for all time the true doctrine regarding the inspiration and use of Holy Scripture. We pray God to prosper this huge undertaking, which will shed such lustre upon the Catholic science of our generation, and we sincerely trust that the great publishing house which shouldered the immense enterprise will come out of it without serious financial loss. The "Goncilium Tridentinum" alone would suffice to immortalize and endear to Catholics the name of Herder.

Der Index det Verbotenen Buecher: in seiner neuen Fassung dargelegt und rechtlich-historisch gewuerdigt: Von *Joseph Hilgers, S. J.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, $3.25 net.

This is a most instructive and interesting treatise on the important subject of the ecclesiastical censure of books, which the learned author treats from the two-fold standpoint of canon law and history. The present legislation is the work of the immortal Pontiff, Leo XIII., of happy memory, whose reforming hand is visible in this, as in so many other phases of pontifical solicitude. By his Bull "Officiorum ac munerum," dated January 25, 1897, the great Pope

thoroughly revised the legislation of his predecessors, making such changes and modifications as the changed conditions of modern life seemed to demand. Proceeding along the lines marked by this constitution, the Sacred Congregation of the Index, three years later, issued a revised edition of the "Index Librorum Prohibitorum," which, being issued by order and authority of the Vicar of Christ, obtains everywhere full force of law and must be accepted with reverent obedience by all faithful children of the Church. The opinion sometimes expressed that at the present time, or in certain countries, the laws of the Index have no binding force will thus be seen to be entirely erroneous. The theory that our people may wander at will in forbidden literary pastures is as pernicious as that other theory that "the American girl needs no chaperon." No one, not even the most learned or holy, not even he who does so in the discharge of duty, can read a bad book with perfect impunity. Some of the poison is sure to take effect. Some people seem to be of opinion that the censure of books is a peculiarly Catholic institution; but Father Hilgers, surveying one country after another, shows conclusively that Protestant rulers have been, to say the least, equally vigilant and severe, especially in prohibiting the circulation of Catholic doctrine. The whole treatise is excellent and timely. Particularly useful is the general index of authors and works at the end, greatly facilitating the use of the book.

WEBSTER'S INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. G. & C. Merriam Company, Springfield, Mass., 1904.

This is substantially the same as the edition of 1890, except that here we have a Supplement containing an addition of 25,000 words, phrases and definitions prepared under the direct supervision of William T. Harris, Ph. D., LL. D., United States Commissioner of Education, assisted by a large corps of competent specialists and editors. The Dictionary is thus modernized and brought down to the beginning of the new century.

The ten years elapsing between the publication of the 1890 edition and that at present before us were years of swift growth and great development in movements social, industrial and intellectual. The language grew with these movements, and it was to cope with this enlargement that the Supplement of 25,000 additional words and phrases was compiled.

Tastes with regard to dictionaries differ widely, some preferring this lexicon and some that; but we should say that, in words relating to Catholic affairs at least—such words, for instance, as "Jesuit"

and its derivatives, and "indulgences"—Webster's International, while not so full in its definitions as other dictionaries, is more just and satisfactory. The pronouncing biographical section is up-to-date in its information, and gives a number of Catholic worthies. We fail to find the name, however, of "Jack" Barry, Father of the American Navy, although other naval officers with far less claims to be remembered are given. The compiler makes some curious distinctions. Thomas Moore is described as an Irish poet, but Oliver Goldsmith is given as an *English* man of letters, and Dean Swift as a *British* author. Bishop Potter, of New York, finds a place, but we look in vain for Bishop Spalding, of Peoria.

On the whole, one can find but little fault with this edition of Webster's International Dictionary. It amply sustains the claims made for it by the publishers.

HERDER'S KONVERSATIONS-LEXIKON. Dritte Auflage; Reich Illustriert durch Text-abbildumgen, Tafeln und Karten. Zweiter Band: Bonar bis Eldorado. Dritter Band: Elea bis Gyulay. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo. Price, $3.50 per vol.

We are in receipt of Volumes II. and III. of the third edition of Herder's "Konversations-Lexikon," which bring the work down to the letter H. We find this Lexicon quite as indispensable for secular matters as the well-known "Kirchen-Lexikon" for religious affairs. For copious and accurate information on all possible subjects of interest, condensed into the smallest compass, it is without a peer. Any one who possesses these two lexicons may dispense with three-fourths of the remaining books of his library. We are particularly pleased that biographical notices are not confined to those who are dead. It is generally more difficult to obtain information about our contemporaries than about people who lived centuries ago.

THE HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA AND ITS MISSIONS. By *Brian J. Clinch.* 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 700, illustrated. $5.00. San Francisco: Whittaker & Rey.

This very interesting historical work from the pen of one of our oldest and ablest contributors is now on the press, and will probably be ready when this number of the QUARTERLY comes into the hands of our readers. It purports to tell the story of both the secular and religious settlements of the two Californias from the time of Cortez to the union of New California with the United States. The writer further traces the steps by which the general mission

system was evolved in Spanish America during the sixteenth century. The parts in its evolution played separately by religious zeal, enlightened policy and vulgar greed among the early conquerors are illustrated by historical documents. The shares taken respectively by the Spanish authorities and religious orders of the Church in the work of civilizing the savage tribes of America are treated at length. Among the subjects specially touched on are the policy of Isabella, Ximenes and Charles V. towards Indian rights, the ideals of civilization of the Spanish rulers, the actual relations between the State and Catholic missions, the origin of the Pious Fund, the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain and the true meaning of secularization of missions according to Spanish law. Any communications regarding the book may be sent to the Rev. Father Kenna, S. J., Santa Clara College, Cal.

LES SAINTS: SAINTE GERMAINE COUSIN (1579-1601), par *Louis Veuillot*, complétée par *Francois Veuillot*. Un vol. in-12 de ii.+197 pages.

LE BIENHEUREUX THOMAS MORE (1478-1535), par *Henri Brémond*. I. vol. in-12 de viii.+193 pages.

SAINT LEON IX. (1002-1054), par l'abbé *Eug. Martin*, docteur ès lettres, professeur à l'École Saint-Sigisbert, de Nancy. I. vol. in-12 de viii.+208 pages.

LA BIENHEUREUSE JEANNE DE LESTONNAC (1556-1640), par l'abbé *R. Couzard*, docteur ès lettres, supérieur du petit séminaire d'Agen. I. vol. in-12 de 220 pages.

SAINT WANDRILLE (VI.-VII. siecle), par *Dom Besse*. I. vol. in-12 de v.+183 pages. Librairie Victor Lecoffre, Paris.

At a time when Germaine Cousin was not yet Blessed, Louis Veuillot had devoted to her a little book which was long neglected. The editors of "The Saints" have reprinted it, adding to it materially by the pen of Francois Veuillot, the nephew of the great controversialist and the well-known editor of "l'Univers." Francois Veuillot has found new and interesting details in the process of canonization, in the series of miracles recently performed under the invocation of the saint and in the history of her veneration. This last part is of our own time and places in a clear light the power exercised so long after her death by the spirit of the modest shepherdess and by the acts of faith which have gained her aid.

Few persons are aware that Thomas More, better known under the name of Thomas Morus, is entitled to a place among the saints. Many may even be astonished to see the great chancellor of Henry VIII., the friend of Erasmus, the author of Utopia, the thrice-married man, known for his flashes of wit and his good humor, taking

a place in such a company. Nothing, however, is more certain; Thomas More has been beatified by the Catholic Church, by whom he is justly considered a martyr. He was beheaded by order of the King for having willed to maintain the rights of the Holy See and Catholic morals by refusing to recognize the spiritual sovereignty which Henry claimed for himself. It is this life and death of which M. Henri Bremond tells, a writer of whom the Society of Jesus was very proud. Since the suppression of the congregations M. Bremond has resided in London; from there he sends us this original and charming volume, in which the secular life of Blessed Thomas is analyzed with a rare delicacy and his death described in a most edifying manner.

Abbé Martin is well known to the learned world by his fine history of the dioceses of Toul and Nancy, works crowned by the Institute. He now gives us the history of a man honored by all Alsace and Lorraine, Bruno the Alsatian, afterwards Pope Leo IX. Leo IX. reëstablished order in the Church, reformed the clergy, worked without ceasing for peace among the nations. Finally he began forcibly that social work which was to make illustrious Gregory VII. Abbé Martin's work is new, solid, clearly composed and agreeably written.

Jeanne de Lestonnac, Marquise de Montferrand, the niece of Montaigne, had seen with sorrow her mother become a Calvinist, and has thus been thrown into the midst of the religious agitation of the end of the sixteenth century. After twenty-four years of a happy marriage which had been blessed with numerous children, she resolved to found in her country of Guyenne a religious order as the saintly widow of Jeanne de Chantal had done in Bourgogne. The principal object she had in mind was to provide teachers for young girls, fitted to guard them from heresy. At the present time, two years after her beatification, her religious—those of Notre Dame—are twenty-eight hundred in number, educating nearly twenty thousand young girls in seventy-seven communities, scattered over two worlds. It is this life that has been written by Abbé Couzard, superior of the petit seminaire of Agen. He was on the very spot to best gather the documents for it; he has accomplished his useful task with pleasing pathos.

The well-known Benedictine Dom Besse sends us from his exile the life of one of his most illustrious predecessors in the religious life during the last twelve hundred years, Saint Wandrille, abbot of

Fontenelle, in Normandy. After having been one of the "paladins" of King Dagobert, Saint Wandrille entered the order of Saint Benedict, and he was one of the most useful creators of those centres of Christian life and true civilization which we call monasteries. The one which he founded and which was consecrated by Saint Ouen, Bishop of Rouen, contained three hundred monks; it was one of our first schools of agriculture, rural industry and commerce. Assured learning, clearness, serenity, cordial and restful simplicity—such are the characteristics which Benedictine tradition gives us in this little volume.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE MOTHER OF GOD. An exposition by *Archbishop Ullathrone*. Revised by Canon Iles, D. D., with an introduction by the Bishop of Birmingham. 12mo., pp. 222. New York: Benziger Brothers.

It is certainly fitting that a new and revised edition of Bishop Ullathorne's work on the Immaculate Conception should appear in this year of jubilee. It has stood the test of time, which is the severest of all tests, and therefore is worthy of reproduction.

It was the production of a busy man, as most good things are, having been written by the author in 1854 in the intervals of leisure to be found during the course of a canonical visitation of his diocese. It was first printed in 1855, and reprinted several times from the original plates. The author always intended to revise it and enlarge it, and actually began the work, but did not complete it.

The Bishop of Birmingham, under whose direction this edition was prepared, entrusted the work of revision to Very Rev. Canon Iles, who tells us that his time has been given principally to verifying and correcting references. He has made some slight changes and has added the notes and other matter prepared by the right reverend author.

The book is very nicely made and should receive a hearty welcome at this time, when the attention of the whole Christian world is drawn to the blessed subject by the universal jubilee in honor of the promulgation of the dogma.

LIVES OF THE ENGLISH MARTYRS DECLARED BLESSED BY POPE LEO XIII. IN 1886 AND 1895. Written by Fathers of the Oratory, of the Secular Clergy and of the Society of Jesus. Completed and edited by Dom Bede Camm, O. S. B., of Erdington Abbey. Vol. I. Martyrs Under Henry VIII. 12mo., pp. lxvi.+547. London: Burns & Oakes. New York: Benziger Brothers.

How good it is and consoling to have the lives of these blessed servants of God, our dear brethren in Christ, rightly written and

preserved for the greater glory of God and for our edification. Even if only one copy were made, as in ancient times, it would be an occasion for rejoicing, but now that the glorious record can be multiplied and spread throughout the world, we should rejoice universally. We have met all this glorious company before, but they were in the midst of such turmoil and bloodshed and were hurried past with the great rush of events that we scarcely had time to recognize them. Now, however, in this book, and in others which will follow, they are set before us in all their grandeur of Christ's holy martyrs.

In order to make a proper setting for the picture the book begins with a description of beatification. Then follows a history of the persecution which crowned the blessed company, and then the holy ones pass before us suffering persecution for Jesus' sake and entering into the kingdom of heaven.

Blessed John Lisher and Blessed Thomas More are the best known of the band, but the reader will be equally edified and strengthened by the examples of the others, who occupied positions not so conspicuous.

The authors are Dom Bede Camm, O. S. B., Father Edward S. Keogh, Cong. Orat., Father John Morris, S. J., Father John Pollen, S. J., and Father Richard Stanton, Cong. Orat.

IMITATION OF THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS. By *Rev. F. Arnondt, S. J.* Translated from the Latin by I. M. Fastre. New Edition with Morning Prayers, Devotions for Mass, Confession, Communion, etc. 16mo., pp. 734. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This book, modeled on the "Imitation of Christ," was written in Amercia in 1846 in fulfillment of a promise made during a serious illness. It has the reputation of being a work of great merit, and a worthy companion of the "Imitation," by a'Kempis, which it is said to surpass in regularity of plan. It is also said to be more complete and more definite. It is divided into books, as the "Imitation" is, and Jesus and the Disciple are introduced, but there is a "Directory" before each book which sets forth the plan with the means to carry it out and the end to be attained. The book is most suitable for meditation. It contains a storehouse of matter on the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and will be of special value to directors and promoters.

OXFORD CONFERENCES ON PRAYER. By *Fr. Vincent McNabb, O. P.* St. Louis: B. Herder. Price, 90 cents.

These eight conferences on prayer, written from notes of sermons

delivered by the distinguished Dominican before the Catholic undergraduates of the University of Oxford, are models of the best type of oratory for which his order is renowned. We here find, as was to be expected, solid Thomistic theology used as the foundation of an edifice of piety. Father McNabb is master of a very engaging style and must be an interesting and impressive preacher. We anticipate that his little book will become a great favorite for spiritual retreats of the clergy, to which purpose, in form and matter, it is admirably adapted. We found the conference on "The Prayer of Christ" was of particular inspiration.

THE YOUNG PRIEST: Conferences on the Apostolic Life. By *Herbert, Cardinal Vaughan,* Archbishop of Westminster. Edited by his brother Monsignor, Canon John S. Vaughan. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. Price, $2.00 net.

This admirable little book was written by the late lamented Archbishop of Westminster during his last illness, and may be called his last will and testament to the clergy who had received the grace of priestly ordination by the imposition of his hands. He speaks to them in the most loving terms, from a heart overflowing with love of God and solicitude for the salvation of souls. It is replete with the wisdom accumulated during a lengthy and fruitful career in the priesthood and episcopy. Happy the priest, young or old, who will take to heart and follow out in life the paternal admonitions of the saintly Cardinal.

A STRANGE RAILROAD WRECK. By *George Collins.* 12mo., pp. 40. New York: Broadway Publishing Co., 835 Broadway.

We are glad to call attention to this book, not only because the story is interesting, but principally because the author is one who has been grievously afflicted since boyhood, for more than twenty years, with rheumatism in such a form as to almost completely disable him. He hopes to obtain sufficient funds from the sale of this book to enable him to continue treatment which has very much benefitted him, but which he had to give up for want of means. He will send the book directly to any one who forwards sixty-five cents to him at Elco, Washington county, Pa.

PRAYERS AND MEDITATIONS ON THE LIFE OF CHRIST. By *Thomas Haemerken à'Kempis,* Canon Regular of the Order of St. Augustine. Translated by W. Duthoit, D. C. L. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. Price, $1.35.

This is a beautiful collection of prayers and meditations on the

life of our Lord, chiefly on His sacred passion and death. It is in every way worthy of the immortal author of the "Imitation of Christ," and we are pleased to have it in a form accessible to English readers. We recommend it especially for readings during Lent.

LES DERNIERS JOURS DE LÉON XIII. ET LE CONCLAVE, par *Un Temoin.* I. vol. in-18 jésus. Librairie Victor Lecoffre, Paris.

The events which happened at Rome during the last days of Leo XIII. and at the time of the assembling of the Conclave which elected His Holiness Pius X. have thus far been told in an incomplete and often inexact manner. It has appeared necessary to the author of this little work to reëstablish the facts under their respective dates. The volume is signed "A Witness," but this signature, it is believed, is that of a French prelate of whom much has lately been said.

ÜBERTIN VON CASALE UND DESSEN IDEENKREIS. Ein Beitrag zum Zeitalter Dantes. Von *Dr. Joh. Chrysostomus Huck.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, $1.00.

In this charming little essay the learned author gives a masterly description of the religious controversies which disturbed the world, and especially the Order of St. Francis, in the age of Dante. It is a most acceptable addition to the voluminous literature of the great Catholic poet.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

B. ALBERTI MAGNI O. PRÆD. Commentarii in Iob. Abbitamentum ad Opera Omnia. B. Alberti primum ex codicibus manuscriptis edidit Melchior Weiss. Freiburg and St. Louis: Sumptubus Herder. Price, $4. $9 net.

DIE WIRKUNGEN DES BISSAKRAMENTES. Dogmengeschichtliche Studie. Von *Dr. Joseph Gœetler.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, $2.25 net.

SANSTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI LEONIS DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPÆ EPISTOLÆ ENCUCLICÆ. A Latin and German edition of the late Pontiff's Eucyclicals in six volumes.

A PRECURSOR OF ST. PHILIP: The Life of Buonsignore Cacciaguerra. By *Lady Amabel Kerr.* St. Louis: B. Herder. Price, $1.25 net.

DE ACTIBUS HUMANIS. Auctore *Victore Frins, S. J.* Pars II., De Actibus Humanis moraliter consideratis. Friburgi Brisgoviæ: Sumptibus Herder. Price, $2.85 net.